UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

V.

Criminal Action
No. 13-10200-GAO

DZHOKHAR A. TSARNAEV, also
known as Jahar Tsarni,

Defendant.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE GEORGE A. O'TOOLE, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

JURY TRIAL - DAY EIGHTEEN

John J. Moakley United States Courthouse
Courtroom No. 9
One Courthouse Way
Boston, Massachusetts 02210
Friday, February 13, 2015
10:54 a.m.

Marcia G. Patrisso, RMR, CRR
Cheryl Dahlstrom, RMR, CRR
Official Court Reporters
John J. Moakley U.S. Courthouse
One Courthouse Way, Room 3510
Boston, Massachusetts 02210
(617) 737-8728

Mechanical Steno - Computer-Aided Transcript

1	APPEARANCES:
2	OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY By: William D. Weinreb and Aloke Chakravarty, Assistant U.S. Attorneys
4	John Joseph Moakley Federal Courthouse Suite 9200
5	Boston, Massachusetts 02210
6	FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER OFFICE By: Miriam Conrad, Federal Public Defender
7	51 Sleeper Street Fifth Floor Boston, Massachusetts 02210
8	- and - CLARKE & RICE, APC
9	By: Judy Clarke, Esq. 1010 Second Avenue
LO	Suite 1800 San Diego, California 92101
L1	- and - LAW OFFICE OF DAVID I. BRUCK
12	By: David I. Bruck, Esq. 220 Sydney Lewis Hall
L3	Lexington, Virginia 24450 On Behalf of the Defendant
L 4	
L 5	
L 6	
L 7	
L 8	
L 9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

<u>PROCEEDINGS</u>

02:07 20

02:06 10

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for being here today. We're continuing the process of selecting a jury for the trial of the case of United States vs. Dzhokhar Tsarnaev. As you know, Mr. Tsarnaev is charged in connection with a bombing that occurred near the finish line of the Boston Marathon on April 15, 2013, that resulted in the deaths of three people. He is also charged in the death of an MIT police officer and other offenses occurring on April 18 and 19, 2013. Some, but not all, of the crimes charged are, by statute, potentially punishable by death.

You will recall from my prior instructions that the trial jury will first consider and decide whether the government has proved Mr. Tsarnaev's guilt of any or all of the charges against him. If he is convicted of any of the capital crimes, that is crimes, potentially punishable by death, the jury will then consider and decide whether he will be sentenced to death or to life in prison without possibility of release.

You may wonder why the death penalty could be a possibility in this case in view of the fact that the laws of Massachusetts do not provide for the death penalty for murder or any other violation of Massachusetts law. The reason is that this is a federal case involving alleged violations of the laws of the United States rather than a state case involving violations of Massachusetts law.

02:08 20

02:08 10

So if the jury convicts Mr. Tsarnaev of any of the capital crimes charged in the Indictment, the same jury will hear additional evidence and then decide whether to sentence him to death or to life in prison without the possibility of release.

Because the jury that is selected to decide the defendant's guilt or innocence will also decide his punishment, if he is convicted, it is necessary to question prospective jurors about your feelings and beliefs about the death penalty as part of this process of selecting the jury.

Let me explain briefly the procedures that must be followed in a case in which the death penalty is or may be at issue. As in any criminal case, initially, the government will have the burden of proving that Mr. Tsarnaev is, in fact, guilty of any crime with which he is charged. If he is convicted by the jury of a crime for which the death penalty may lawfully be imposed, then there will be a second phase of the trial, usually referred to in shorthand as the "penalty phase." In the penalty phase, the government will introduce evidence that seeks to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, first, that the defendant acted with sufficient intent to be subject to the death penalty; and second, that aggravating factors about the killings or about the defendant justify sentencing him to death.

Aggravating factors are circumstances that, if proven,

02:10 20

02:09 10

make the crimes particularly serious or blameworthy, therefore, under the law, may justify imposing a more severe sentence on Mr. Tsarnaev compared to other persons convicted of intentional killing or murder.

The government will bear the burden of proving any alleged aggravating factors to every juror beyond a reasonable doubt.

The defense will have an opportunity to present evidence in the penalty phase of what it will argue are mitigating factors. Mitigating factors are usually circumstances about the crime or about the defendant's background or character that would suggest the death penalty is not the appropriate sentence in this case or that life imprisonment without possibility of release is adequate to punish the defendant. Unlike the proof of aggravating factors, a mitigating factor must only be proven by the greater weight of the evidence. That is a less standard of proof than proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Again, unlike the proof of aggravating factors, mitigating factors do not have to be proven to the satisfaction of all 12 jurors. Any juror who finds or determines a mitigating factor to be proven by the greater weight of the evidence may consider that factor in deciding the appropriate sentence in the case regardless of whether any or all of the other jurors agree that the mitigating factor has been proven.

02:11 20

02:11 10

After the parties have made their preparations during the penalty phase, the jury will weigh all the evidence. Before a jury could vote to impose the death penalty, every juror would have to be persuaded that certain threshold factors that make Mr. Tsarnaev potentially subject to the death penalty have been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. In addition, in order to impose the death penalty, every juror would have to be persuaded that any proven aggravating factors sufficiently outweigh any mitigating factors found by any juror or jurors to justify a sentence of death. Even if the jury did not find any mitigating factors in the case, he would still have to be unanimously persuaded that any proven aggravating factors were themselves sufficient to justify a death penalty.

You should understand that a jury is never required to sentence a defendant to death. The decision whether the government has proved that a defendant should be sentenced to death must ultimately be made by each juror himself or herself. If, however, every juror is persuaded that the death penalty should be imposed, I would be required, as the trial judge, to sentence the defendant to death. In other words, I could not change the jury's decision. The jury, and not the judge, is responsible for determining whether a defendant who is convicted of a capital crime will live or die.

What I've just described is only an overview of the law applicable to a jury's consideration of the death penalty.

02:13 20

02:12 10

If you are selected to serve on the jury, and if you find the defendant guilty of a crime or crimes punishable by death, then I will give you very detailed instructions concerning your duties in deciding whether to impose the death penalty or life imprisonment without possibility of release and the law that must be followed in making that decision.

When you filled out your questionnaires, you will recall that we told you that there are no right or wrong answers to the questions you have been asked. That's true of those you will be asked further in this process. We asked them primarily because both the government and Mr. Tsarnaev are entitled to a jury that does not have its mind firmly made up one way or the other before hearing the evidence and a detailed explanation of the law. That applies both to whether Mr. Tsarnaev is guilty or not guilty of the specific crimes that are charged in the Indictment and, if he is convicted of a capital crime, whether he should be sentenced to death or to life in prison without the possibility of release.

So today I'm going to question each of you individually about issues relevant to the selection of a jury. We're going to have you go back into the room where you were just awaiting your entry into the courtroom. You'll wait there, and we'll call you in one by one and ask you some questions. There will be a few people in the room in addition to the lawyers and their staffs, and the proceedings will be

02:14 20

02:14 10

simultaneously transmitted by audio and video to overflow courtrooms where there are other people attending.

We will not identify you by name but rather by number, and you will seated so that the video camera will be behind you. Your answers will be generally public; but if you believe that a truthful answer would require you to reveal sensitive, personal information, we will temporarily stop the audio transmission to those courtrooms so that the people observing there will not hear your answer.

Again, we do not want or expect any particular answer to the questions. All we want and what the law expects is for you to provide accurate and truthful answers to the questions you're asked. If you do that, you will be doing your duty as a citizen and as a juror no matter what the answers may be.

I want to take a moment to remind you of some of my prior instructions. As I told you before, a jury's verdict must be based on the evidence produced at trial and must be free of outside influence. Therefore, I remind you again it is extremely important that you do not discuss the case, including the selection process, with your family, friends, each other or any other person until you have been excused or if you are selected as a juror, until the case concludes. Again, you are to avoid any independent research on the case online or otherwise and to avoid reading, watching, listening to media reports about the case.

```
1
                   When you finished completing the questionnaires, we
          asked you to sign the questionnaire under an affirmation that
     2
          the answers you had given were true. There's a similar process
     3
          for this oral examination. You are required to swear or affirm
     4
     5
          that you will give true answers to the questions. And the
     6
          clerk will now ask you to stand and administer that oath and
          affirmation.
     7
          (Venire sworn.)
     8
     9
                   THE COURT: All right, jurors. Thank you. We'll ask
02:15 10
          you to step out, and we'll have you back one by one.
    11
           (The venire left the courtroom at 11:02 a.m.)
                   MR. WEINREB: Your Honor, I don't think we had a
    12
    13
          chance to give you these earlier. They're nonissues.
    14
                   THE COURT: Nonissues?
    1.5
                   MR. WEINREB: Yeah, I think. I don't know if you
    16
          agree.
    17
                   MS. CONRAD: I only looked at one of them.
    18
                   THE COURT: There's one.
    19
                   MR. WEINREB: 412.
02:18 20
                   MS. CONRAD: I think they both answered consistently.
    21
                   MR. WEINREB: I think the other was 440.
    22
                   THE COURT: 440, yeah.
    23
                   MS. CLARKE: 440 is gone.
    24
                   THE COURT: Yeah, right. So this is just a very minor
    25
          -- so there's no -- there's agreement on 412, no issue?
```

```
1
                   MS. CONRAD: That's right, yeah.
                   THE COURT: Okay.
     2
                   THE CLERK:
                                Juror No. 412.
     3
                   THE JURY CLERK: Juror 412.
     4
     5
                   THE CLERK: Sir, over here, please, if you would.
     6
          Have a seat.
     7
                   THE COURT: Good morning.
                   THE JUROR: Morning.
     8
     9
                   THE COURT: Have you been able to avoid any discussion
02:19 10
          of the substance of the case since you were last here and media
    11
          reports as well?
    12
                   THE JUROR: I have, yes.
    13
                   THE COURT:
                                Okay. So that's the questionnaire that
    14
          you filled out when you were last here.
    15
                   THE JUROR: Yes, looks like it.
    16
                   THE COURT: I'm going to follow up on some of the
    17
          questions -- some of the answers you gave us to the questions
    18
          we asked, okay?
    19
                   I'd like to start with what you do for a living.
02:20 20
                   THE JUROR: Self-employed contractor. I grew up as a
    21
          kid doing roofing, and that kind of -- once I built my own
    22
          home, I expanded my skills off into other areas of construction
    23
          so --
    24
                   THE COURT: How long have you been doing it?
    25
                   THE JUROR: Thirty-five, forty years.
```

THE COURT: Do you have a work force that works with you?

02:21 20

02:21 10

THE JUROR: Actually, I used to have employees, but in the last two and a half years, I have shrunk down to -- I've taken on a partner, and I work solely with one partner. He's his own insured contractor himself. We just work as a team.

THE COURT: Okay. You'll recall back on Page 5 of the form, in Question 10, we outlined the schedule that we expect to follow in the case. It will be four days a week from 9 to 4, excluding Fridays. On that schedule, it may last several months. Would that have an impact on your ability to earn a living?

THE JUROR: There would be a little bit of a strain, financial strain. I'm looking -- I was hoping that I had an opportunity to take on some night work for a gentleman that I had became an acquaintance with when I did a project, who's a CEO of this company that does IT equipment in hospitals, and it's all night work. When that came about, I thought maybe it would be very -- take a lot of stress off the family financially. If I was involved with any kind of jury service, then I could work at night so --

THE COURT: You're the one that can assess it. I raise the question because we don't want to impose a serious hardship, including a financial hardship on you. In other words, if you can make arrangements to continue working and,

```
1
          therefore, your income in the hours after the day or on Fridays
          and weekends, then that's okay, too. But you're really the
     2
          judge of that. We can't --
     3
     4
                   THE JUROR: It would be a strain on my income so --
     5
                   THE COURT: Is it a tolerable strain or an intolerable
          strain, I guess is the question.
     6
                   THE JUROR: A tolerable strain.
     7
                   THE COURT: Okay. So --
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: Uncomfortably tolerable.
02:22 10
                   THE COURT: You're willing to take on the project if
    11
          we give it to you?
    12
                   THE JUROR: Yes, yes, sir.
    13
                   THE COURT: All right. You said you just -- we asked
    14
          people about social media. You said you're just learning to
    15
          use Facebook. Do you use it just personally, socially, or do
    16
          you use it in the business at all?
    17
                   THE JUROR: Not in the business at all, no. I'm
    18
          actually still trying to learn how to send email from the iPad
    19
          that I got for Christmas to my home computer so I can print out
02:22 20
          information. I'm kind of still old school, with a pencil and
    21
          paper.
    22
                   THE COURT: You have a brother who was a police
    23
          officer in New Hampshire for a number of years?
    24
                   THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
    25
                   THE COURT: Tell us about that. Where was he?
```

1 THE JUROR: He was 20 years as a sergeant with the New Hampshire, Hudson, New Hampshire, Municipal Department. He had 2 been in it probably --3 4 THE COURT: What's he doing now? 5 THE JUROR: He's retired now. 6 THE COURT: Let me ask you to turn to Page 20, 7 Question 77, near the top. In this question we asked you whether -- if you'd seen or read things in the media that had 8 9 led you to form an opinion about whether the defendant was 02:24 10 quilty or not quilty or should receive the death penalty or

not. It's a multiple part question, and you had the option of checking "yes," "no," or "unsure," and you checked "unsure."

Would you tell us why you made that selection?

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

02:25 20

THE JUROR: Well, I made that selection due to the fact that I have two brothers and three sisters. And I was wondering about, like, the design of the whole act, how -- what had come about. Was the young man following his brother's -- looking up to his brother as his -- you know, like a model to follow? And probably just making some really bad decisions due to the fact that -- what I can relate to was, like, when I was a kid -- I have an older brother; he likes to drink. I thought that was like a really great thing to do. Because my older brother liked to drink, so I drank.

It took a few years for me to, like, grow up and get that out of my system. And I realized I had lost a few years

due to the fact that someone that I looked up to led me in a direction I probably, you know, would not have been -- gone in that direction had I had a little more maturity or somebody different to look up to. So, I mean, I think about that, and I'm, like, well, I'm unsure. I'm unsure about that question and that whole situation.

THE COURT: So I'm sure you realize, in the criminal process, that -- in our justice system, when somebody is accused of a crime, they're presumed to be innocent, or not guilty, unless the government proves that they're guilty of the crime charged and does it by the evidence produced at the trial. And in order to obtain a verdict of guilty, the government has to persuade the jury beyond a reasonable doubt of the fact of the defendant's guilt. Do you understand those principles?

THE JUROR: Yes.

02:26 20

02:26 10

THE COURT: What we ask jurors to do is to pay attention to the evidence at trial, to think about it, talk about it with the other jurors, and then decide whether, on any given charge, the government's satisfied its burden of proving that charge beyond a reasonable doubt. And the jurors are to focus only on the evidence at trial and not on information they might have from any other source. Do you think you would be able to do that in this case?

THE JUROR: My heart tells me probably not.

1 THE COURT: Why? THE JUROR: I have a five-year-old grandson at home, 2 and I think of the eight-year-old child losing his life. 3 4 it just kind of comes back to me that was a very selfish act of 5 some people to have robbed a child of their life like that. 6 And I personally don't think that -- I might hold some -- it might have some leverage in making a bad decision because of 7 how I feel about that situation. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. 02:27 10 THE JUROR: My grandchild lives with me, and I've 11 raised him, so I think that's why that -- my feelings towards the child like that bothers me a little. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MR. WEINREB: Your Honor, I think the parties --15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Appreciate that. 16 Just leave it there and we'll pick it up. That's all. THE JUROR: Thank you. 17 THE CLERK: Juror No. 435. 18 19 THE JURY CLERK: Juror 435. 02:28 20 THE CLERK: Sir, over here, if you would, please. 21 Have a seat. 22 THE COURT: Good morning. 23 THE JUROR: Morning. 24 THE COURT: Since you were last here, have you been 25 able to avoid any discussion of the substance of the case with

```
1
          anybody?
                   THE JUROR: I have not discussed it, no.
     2
     3
                   THE COURT: And, as much as possible, avoid any media
     4
          reporting about the case?
     5
                   THE JUROR: Correct.
     6
                   THE COURT: We're going to follow up on some of the
     7
          answers you gave us in the questionnaire. I want to start with
          what you do for a living.
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: I work at Harvard Pilgrim Health
02:29 10
          Insurance. I do accounting, accounts receivable. So the money
    11
          coming in, I account for that.
                   THE COURT: Okay. We asked about use of social media,
    12
    13
          and this is at the bottom of Page 10, Question 29, and 30, I
    14
          quess, on the next page. You said you post messages on
    15
          Facebook, and you don't normally discuss serious -- you said
    16
          serious topics but more on sports. And what's that? Animal --
    17
          no comical subjects.
    18
                   THE JUROR: Uh-huh, yup.
    19
                   THE COURT: Okay. You also use Instagram, I guess.
02:30 20
                   THE JUROR: Correct.
    21
                   THE COURT: Do you use any of those in your work?
    22
                   THE JUROR: I do not, no.
    23
                   THE COURT: So it's just with friends and family kind
    24
          of thing?
    25
                   THE JUROR: Yup, yeah.
```

THE COURT: Let me ask you to turn to Page 20,

Question 77, near the top. If it's convenient to you, feel

free to take the clip off.

THE JUROR: Okay.

02:31 20

02:31 10

THE COURT: In this question we asked whether you had -- on the basis of things you'd seen or read in the media or from other sources whether you'd formed any particular opinions in the case, including whether the defendant was guilty or not or whether he should receive the death penalty or not. And you checked "no" to each of those, indicating that you did not have any such opinion. Can you tell us about that?

THE JUROR: I mean, I've heard, obviously, about, you know, through the news, but I don't really know any specifics of exactly what happened. You know, I would go in with, you know, a clear conscience. I wouldn't go in with a full guilty. I didn't know anyone that was down there or anything like that. So I haven't -- I guess I haven't really heard much about the case, the specifics.

THE COURT: I'm sure you know that, in our criminal justice system, when somebody is accused of a crime, they're presumed to be innocent of the crime they're charged with unless the government proves them guilty by the evidence at trial and proves it beyond a reasonable doubt. You're familiar with those concepts?

THE JUROR: Correct.

1 THE COURT: Do you think, if you were a juror in the case, you could listen to the evidence in the case and decide 2 whether the government had proved its case or not based on your 3 evaluation of that evidence along with the other jurors? 4 5 THE JUROR: Yes. 6 THE COURT: If, on any given charge, you thought the government's evidence had fallen short of convincing you beyond 7 a reasonable doubt, would you be able to vote not guilty? 8 9 THE JUROR: Yes. 02:32 10 THE COURT: Just to confirm, on Page 21, Questions 81 11 and 82, we asked about whether you had any -- whether you were 12 personally affected or had any involvement in support 13 activities, not just you but people close to you. 14 THE JUROR: Uh-huh. 15 THE COURT: You already said it, I guess, but you 16 didn't --17 THE JUROR: No, I did not know anyone. 18 THE COURT: It didn't impact you personally in any 19 way? 02:32 20 THE JUROR: It did not. 21 THE COURT: Or anybody close to you? 22 THE JUROR: No. 23 Beginning on Page 23, at Question 88, we THE COURT: 24 asked a series of questions to gauge prospective jurors' views about the death penalty. Question 88 is itself a general 25

02:34 20

02:33 10

question. If you have any views about it in general, what are they? And you said, "I believe that if the defendant is shown through evidence to be guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, he should be sentenced to death for this heinous crime." Is there anything you want to add or amend about that?

THE JUROR: No. Basically, I believe that if, you know, someone was guilty of, you know, bombing innocent people, I do believe that they should get the death penalty.

THE COURT: Okay. In Question 89, we asked you if you could put yourself on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being strongly opposed, thinking the death penalty should never be imposed, and 10 being strongly in favor, thinking it should be imposed whenever a defendant has been convicted of an intentional murder, and you selected 9. Can you tell us why you made that choice?

THE JUROR: I think, if you intentionally hurt other people, especially in, you know in death, I think you, you know, deserve, you know, an equal punishment.

THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. Then in Question 90, we asked if you could find one of the suggested statements that best represented your views regarding a case where someone has been proved guilty of murder. You selected (e), "I'm in favor of the death penalty, but I could vote for a sentence of life imprisonment without the possibility of release if I believed the sentence was called for by the facts and the law of the

1 | case." Does that represent your view?

THE JUROR: Correct.

02:36 20

02:35 10

THE COURT: That seems a little bit different from what you said in answer to the other questions where you seemed more -- thinking more of it, if the person has been guilty of an intentional murder, that the death penalty might almost be automatic afterwards. This seems like you don't necessarily think it's automatic. I guess -- I wonder if you could explain where you are on that.

THE JUROR: Do you mind if I just read through it again?

THE COURT: Yes, please. Take your time.

THE JUROR: That one just fits my belief the most just because it's basically saying that you're listening to the facts and making a judgment on that. If guilty, you know, like I said, I would be for the death penalty. If, you know, did not a hundred percent, you know, I may not, you know, life imprisonment may fit.

THE COURT: Let me be sure you're following the process we would take. First of all, there would be two phases to the trial. The first phase would be whether the defendant is guilty or not of any crime, including any of the charged capital crimes. In order for the government to prove him guilty, as we were discussing, the government would have to prove to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt that, as a matter

02:37 20

02:37 10

of fact, the defendant was guilty of the crime charged, okay? So the jury would then decide that.

And if they found him guilty, then you would proceed to the second phase, which is the penalty phase. So everybody who enters the penalty phase has already been found guilty of an intentional murder by the jury. So when the penalty situation arises, it's dealing with a convicted intentional murderer.

Then, as I said this morning to the group, in the penalty phase, there would be additional evidence. The government would provide evidence of what it will call aggravating factors or circumstances that made this a particularly serious, blameworthy crime. The defense would be able to present evidence of what might be mitigating factors that show that, in this case of murder for this crime, the death penalty is not the appropriate punishment but life imprisonment is instead.

And then the jurors would be asked to deliberate on all that evidence and each of them come to an individual assessment and decision about whether the death penalty was the right punishment to vote for or life in prison, okay? So that's the process.

THE JUROR: Okav.

THE COURT: It seemed you might be mixing the guilt phase and the penalty phase.

02:39 20

02:38 10

As you think about the penalty phase then, would you be able, as statement (e) indicates, to make a decision after considering all the facts, the aggravating circumstances, the mitigating circumstances, and after all that, make a decision without being committed one way or the other, or is your tendency to favor the death penalty for what you've I think referred to as a heinous crime? Would that be -- really exclude a serious consideration of the possibility of life imprisonment?

THE JUROR: If -- I wasn't aware that there was two

THE JUROR: If -- I wasn't aware that there was two phases like that. If found guilty, I would be for the death penalty.

THE COURT: Regardless of what you heard in the second phase?

THE JUROR: Correct, yeah. If he were guilty of those crimes, I would favor the death penalty.

THE COURT: Let me just ask a little bit further. If you go to Page 25, at the bottom, Question 95, we asked, If you found this defendant guilty and you decided the death penalty was the appropriate punishment, could you conscientiously vote for the death penalty? And you said "yes," right?

THE JUROR: Correct, yes.

THE COURT: On the top of the next page, we asked, If you found the defendant guilty and you decided life in prison without the possibility of release was the appropriate

```
1
          punishment, could you vote for life imprisonment without the
          possibility of release? And you said "yes" to that.
     2
                   THE JUROR: I wasn't aware of those two phases like
     3
     4
          that. I thought guilty there would be two -- I didn't realize
     5
          there would be two phases like that. If guilty, I would favor
     6
          the death penalty.
     7
                   THE COURT: Okay. So you would change the answer to
          96?
     8
                   THE JUROR: I would, correct, after knowing that.
     9
02:39 10
                   THE COURT: Okav.
    11
                   MR. WEINREB: Your Honor, if I could inquire?
    12
                   Good morning. My name is Bill Weinreb. I'm one of
    13
          the prosecutors. I just want to make sure I understand one
    14
          thing about your answers clearly.
    15
                   THE JUROR: Okay.
    16
                   MR. WEINREB: Let's put this case aside for a minute.
          Now we're just talking in general.
    17
    18
                   THE JUROR: Okay.
    19
                   MR. WEINREB: Do you believe that all cases of
02:40 20
          intentional, deliberate murder deserve the death penalty or
    21
          that some are -- some may be deserving of a lesser sentence
    22
          than the death penalty, depending on the evidence and the
    23
          circumstances?
    24
                   THE JUROR: For an intentional murder, I do believe
    25
          that the death penalty is the correct --
```

```
1
                   MR. WEINREB: In every case?
                   THE JUROR: If they're guilty of murder, correct, like
     2
          intentional murder.
     3
     4
                   MR. WEINREB: Okay.
     5
                   THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. Just leave
          the form there. We'll take care of it. Thanks.
     6
                   THE CLERK: Juror No. 441.
     7
                   THE JURY CLERK: Juror No. 441.
     8
                   THE CLERK: Sir, over here, please, if you would.
     9
02:41 10
          Have a seat.
    11
                   THE COURT: Good morning.
    12
                   THE JUROR: Morning.
    13
                   THE COURT: Since you were last here, have you been
    14
          able to avoid any discussion of the case?
    15
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    16
                   THE COURT: And, as much as possible, any media
    17
          accounts?
    18
                   THE JUROR: Uh-huh.
    19
                   THE COURT: Okay. So that's the form you filled out
02:42 20
          when you were here. Let me just ask you about your employment.
          What is it you do?
    21
    22
                   THE JUROR: I'm an auditor but I got -- technically, I
    23
          got fired around January 20th for productivity. So I'm
    24
          currently unemployed.
    25
                   THE COURT: Are you looking for work now?
```

THE JUROR: Yes. I'm in the process of trying to 1 collect unemployment and looking. 2 THE COURT: So, as you know, this case may be an 3 extended case for three or four months. Would that interfere 4 5 with your ability to look for employment? 6 THE JUROR: No. I mean, I don't know what I'm -- what I have access to, you know, to look for a job if I were to be 7 in it, but other than that, I would be okay. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. Well, if a job came up and -- we 02:43 10 wouldn't want you to have to turn it down. 11 THE JUROR: Yup. I'm not -- I think I can get a decent job with a little bit of looking for it relatively -- in 12 13 a reasonable amount of time. 14 THE COURT: All right. So you don't object to being 15 considered for the jury? 16 THE JUROR: No, I don't object. 17 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So I see you use Facebook and Instagram about daily. For just social purposes? 18 19 THE JUROR: Yeah. I don't post a lot on them. looked and just fishing through, you know, seeing what's going 02:43 20 2.1 on around. 22 THE COURT: Are you using either in your job search? 23 Do you expect to use either? 24 THE JUROR: Since I lost my job, it's been mainly 25 talking. I got my auditing job through Indeed. I'm going to

1 do that soon, but I kind of wanted to see where the unemployment route was going to go first before I try to get 2 anything concrete. I know I can lock into a job tomorrow if I 3 4 went back to CVS or anything like that. I could go work for 5 retail. I don't particularly want to do that again. 6 THE COURT: So let me ask you to turn to Page 20, Ouestion 77 --7 THE JUROR: Yup. 8 9 THE COURT: -- near the top, we asked whether, based 02:45 10 on things you'd seen or heard in the media or from other 11 sources you had formed an opinion that the defendant was guilty 12 or not quilty on that he should receive the death penalty or 13 not. And you checked "no" to each of those boxes. Could you 14 tell us about that? 15 THE JUROR: More now looking back, as a not guilty. 16 Need to see more evidence, not that, yes, he's guilty or, no, 17 he's not guilty. 18 THE COURT: Okay. So I think you answered in one of 19 the earlier questions that you actually had service -- prior 02:45 20 jury service and it was a criminal case. 21 THE JUROR: Yup. 22 THE COURT: So you're familiar with the principles of 23 the presumption of innocence and the government's obligation to 24 prove crimes beyond a reasonable doubt by the evidence at 25 trial?

1 THE JUROR: Correct. THE COURT: If you were a juror in this case, would 2 3 you be able to apply those principles faithfully to the decision that you would have to make? 4 5 THE JUROR: Yes. 6 THE COURT: If the government failed in respect of any of the charges to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt that 7 the defendant was guilty, would you be able to vote not guilty? 8 9 THE JUROR: Yes. I could vote not quilty. 02:46 10 THE COURT: On Page 21, we asked about potential 11 impacts on you or close -- people close to you. You said there 12 weren't any. 13 THE JUROR: Yeah, nothing, nothing close, no friends, 14 relatives, really, friends of friends. THE COURT: Beginning on Page 23, at Question 88, we 15 16 asked a series of questions about the death penalty and your attitudes about it. 88 itself is a question about general 17 18 views. If you have any views about the death penalty in 19 general, what are they? And you said you don't have any views 02:46 20 either way. 21 THE JUROR: Yeah. I mean, very, very neutral on it. 22 It can be used in certain circumstances or, you know, not used, 23 whatever. I don't really have any concrete feeling on it. 24 THE COURT: In Question 89, we asked you to give us an 25 idea of where you might place yourself on a scale from 1 to 10,

with 1 being strongly opposed, never impose the death penalty, and 10 being strongly favor, impose the death penalty whenever a defendant is convicted of an intentional murder. You put yourself at 7. Can you explain that answer?

THE JUROR: For certain circumstances I would definitely vote for a death penalty, you know, not throwing it around for any particular reason. But 7 is the -- I would be willing to go ahead with it.

THE COURT: Okay. On the next page, Question 90, we asked it in a different way.

THE JUROR: 90?

02:48 20

02:47 10

THE COURT: Page 24, Question 90. If it's easier to look at it -- to unclip it, why don't you take the clip off.

THE JUROR: Yeah. That would probably be easier.

THE COURT: Here we asked -- instead of numbers on a scale, we asked you to read a number of different possible statements and see if there was one that represented what you think about the matter. And this is whether -- what your feelings are when somebody has been convicted of murder. You selected (d). "I'm not for or against the death penalty. I could vote to impose it, or I could vote to impose a sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of release, whichever I believe was called for by the facts and the law in the case."

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Is that a fair summary of your views on

1 the matter? THE JUROR: Yes. That would be a fair summary. 2 THE COURT: So you would be prepared to make a call 3 4 depending on how you assessed the evidence? You heard me talk 5 about the penalty phase. 6 THE JUROR: I would have to see everything before I 7 would lean one way or another first. Don't come to any 8 conclusions until everything is seen. 9 THE COURT: Just a couple more questions. On the next 02:49 10 page, the bottom of 25, Question 95, putting it in the context 11 of this case, If you found this defendant guilty and you 12 decided the death penalty was appropriate, could you 13 conscientiously vote for the death penalty? 14 THE JUROR: Yes. 1.5 THE COURT: And on the top of the next page, we asked 16 a similar question. If you found him guilty and you decided 17 life imprisonment without the possibility of release was the appropriate punishment, could you vote conscientiously for that 18 19 penalty? 02:49 20 THE JUROR: Yes. 21 And you said "yes." THE COURT: 22 THE JUROR: Yup. 23 So those represent your views? THE COURT: 24 THE JUROR: Uh-huh. 25 THE COURT: All right.

MR. WEINREB: Thank you, your Honor. Good morning. 1 THE JUROR: Morning. 2 MR. WEINREB: My name is Bill Weinreb. I'm one of the 3 prosecutors in the case. I just wanted to follow up on a few 4 5 of your answers. 6 THE JUROR: Okay. MR. WEINREB: I may have heard you wrong, but did you 7 say that you hadn't given a lot of thought to the issue of 8 9 death penalty in the past? 02:49 10 THE JUROR: Yeah. I haven't fully looked into it. 11 It's nothing that I really have wanted to in the past or even now. I've thought about it, but I'm at that point where it 12 13 doesn't really matter to me. I'm not super against it, you 14 know, don't do it, or super, you know, let's have the death 15 penalty. I'm kind of neutral on that. 16 MR. WEINREB: Have you thought since -- when did you 17 first learn that you were -- that this case was the one you had been summoned for? 18 19 THE JUROR: About a day or two before. I heard a 02:50 20 couple of things that it might be for that. I didn't think 21 really anything about it; and then in my heart, it could be 22 that case pretty much the night or two before. 23 MR. WEINREB: Since that time, have you given thought 24 to the idea of you personally serving on a case where the death 25 penalty is a possibility?

1 THE JUROR: I would have no issues. 2 MR. WEINREB: I guess the guestion that I really wanted to get at is if -- if you were on a jury, not in this 3 4 case necessarily, just in any case, any case, and the defendant 5 were convicted, and you moved to the penalty phase and you heard evidence that convinced you that the death penalty was 6 the appropriate sentence for a defendant, would you personally 7 be able to sentence someone to death if you concluded that was 8 9 the right sentence? 02:51 10 THE JUROR: Yes, absolutely. 11 MR. WEINREB: Thank you. 12 MR. BRUCK: Good morning. 13 THE JUROR: Good morning. 14 MR. BRUCK: My name is David Bruck, and I am one of 1.5 Jahar Tsarnaev's lawyers. And I've just got a few more questions for you if that's okay. 16 17 THE JUROR: Go right ahead. MR. BRUCK: UMass Lowell? 18 19 THE JUROR: UMass Lowell. 02:51 20 MR. BRUCK: Did you ever take a course from a 21 professor named Horgan, John Horgan? 22 THE JUROR: Not ringing a bell. 23 MR. BRUCK: You told the judge a couple times that 24 your views on the death penalty are that it's appropriate in 25 certain circumstances or certain types of cases. I think those

1 are pretty much the words you used. THE JUROR: Uh-huh. 2 MR. BRUCK: Can you give us some examples, what kinds 3 4 of cases you're thinking about? 5 THE JUROR: If the case has proven to be motivated or 6 something behind it or a severe evil act, something that a lot of people would consider evil, you know. 7 MR. BRUCK: Can you tell me more? 8 MR. WEINREB: Well, your Honor, I don't think he 9 02:52 10 should be asked to precommit. 11 THE COURT: I think that's right. I think it's 12 getting close to that. 13 MR. BRUCK: I'm trying to find out what the juror 14 meant when he said certain kinds of cases. THE JUROR: Very heinous act. 15 16 MR. WEINREB: Objection, your Honor. The question was 17 sustained. 18 THE COURT: Yeah. I think we should get to a 19 different question. 02:53 20 MR. BRUCK: They're not objecting to you. They're 21 objecting to me just so we're clear. 22 Okay. Now that we've been talking about it, you've 23 been talking to the judge a little bit, I guess I want to be 24 sure about your feelings, if any, about the death penalty in this case. You know what case you've been called for? 25

1 THE JUROR: Yes. MR. BRUCK: Do you have -- do you lean either way as 2 far as whether this case is one that is appropriate for the 3 4 death penalty? 5 THE JUROR: I'd have to see everything before I would 6 know if it's going to lean one way or another. I'm not leaning anywhere right now, you know. I don't know if -- you know, 7 guilty, not guilty. I'm unsure until I see all the evidence. 8 9 MR. BRUCK: Okay. Where were you on April 15, 2013, 02:53 10 on the day of the bombing? 11 THE JUROR: I don't know. I was seeking employment at 12 that time. I got hired the following June after that. 13 MR. BRUCK: I guess what I'm really asking you: 14 you remember where you were when you heard about it? 15 THE JUROR: Maybe at my girlfriend at the time's 16 house. 17 MR. BRUCK: Do you remember people talking about it that day when the bombing first occurred? 18 19 THE JUROR: A little bit, you know, what had happened. 02:54 20 MR. BRUCK: How did you feel when you heard about it? 21 THE JUROR: You know, that act occurred, you know. 22 That's not -- you know, not good. I wasn't, you know, too into 23 it or not. I wasn't angry or anything like that. I was just 24 kind of disappointed. 25 MR. BRUCK: Sure. What about the following Friday,

```
the day that people sheltered in place during the manhunt.
     1
          you remember that day?
     2
     3
                   THE JUROR: Not in depth, no, but I'd get updates,
          look at the TV once in a while.
     4
     5
                   MR. BRUCK: Where were you living at the time?
     6
                   THE JUROR: The current house I'm in now, in Woburn,
          Mass. I was staying with a girlfriend in Stoneham back and
     7
          forth a little bit.
     8
     9
                   MR. BRUCK: Did that -- the activities of -- the
02:55 10
          police activities and everything that day and the
    11
          shelter-in-place order, did that affect your activities that
    12
          day?
    13
                   THE JUROR: No, no.
    14
                   MR. BRUCK: In any way at all?
    15
                   THE JUROR: No.
    16
                   MR. BRUCK: That's all I have. Thank you.
    17
                   THE JUROR: Thank you.
    18
                   THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you. Just leave
    19
          those there. We'll pick them up.
02:56 20
                   THE CLERK: Juror No. 444.
    21
                   THE JURY CLERK: Juror 444.
    22
                   THE CLERK: Ma'am, over here, please. Have a seat
    23
          right here.
    24
                   THE COURT: Good morning.
    25
                   THE JUROR: Good morning.
```

```
1
                   THE COURT: Since you were last here to fill out the
          questionnaire, have you been able to avoid discussion of the
     2
          substance of the case?
     3
     4
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
     5
                   THE COURT: And media reports about the case?
                   THE JUROR: No.
                   THE COURT: No, you haven't seen them?
                   THE JUROR: No, I haven't. I haven't been paying
     8
          attention.
     9
02:57 10
                   THE COURT: Yes, okay. So when you filled out the
    11
          form anyway, you told us you were recently unemployed.
    12
          continuing?
    13
                   THE JUROR: Uh-huh.
                   THE COURT: Are you -- you have to answer with a word
    14
    15
          so that the reporter can write down yes or no.
    16
                   THE JUROR: Yes, yes.
    17
                   THE COURT: Okay. Sorry.
    18
                   Are you actively looking for work now or are you --
    19
                   THE JUROR: I've applied with a temp agency.
02:58 20
                   THE COURT: I'm sorry?
    21
                   THE JUROR: I've applied with a temp agency. I am
    22
          working part time. I'm a free-lance reporter for the paper so
    23
          I write occasionally.
    24
                   THE COURT: Right. I see you've done it for several
    25
          papers, it looks like, according to --
```

```
1
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
                   THE COURT: Are there any particular ones you're
     2
          working with now?
     3
                   THE JUROR: I write for the Boston Globe North
     4
     5
          section, so I'm doing that right now. That's the only one I'm
     6
          working for.
                   THE COURT: What kinds of stories do you write?
     7
                   THE JUROR: I write arts and human interest stories
     8
     9
          mostly.
02:58 10
                   THE COURT: You know what the plan is for the case,
    11
          how we plan to have our schedule, four days a week, 9 to 4, and
          so on?
    12
    13
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    14
                   THE COURT: On that schedule, it may last three or
    15
          four months possibly.
    16
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    17
                   THE COURT: Is that going to impact you in your work
          life in a way that would cost you money?
    18
    19
                   THE JUROR: Well, it will interfere with my job search
02:59 20
          if I find an opportunity that would be, you know, a viable way
    21
          for me to make a living.
    22
                   THE COURT: Are you looking for something particular
    23
          in the search? You recently were an English language teacher.
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    24
    25
                   THE COURT: Are you looking for something similar or
```

1 are you kind of casting the net widely to see what might be there? 2 THE JUROR: I'm focusing on international education 3 related fields, nonprofits, and the arts mostly in Boston. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. Well, what do you feel about the 6 prospect of being a juror on the case for a few months? THE JUROR: To be honest, it's pretty nerve-racking, 7 the idea, but I don't know. There's a part of me that is 8 9 intriqued by it as somebody who's a writer and, you know, and a 03:00 10 teacher, and who's worked with students similar to the person 11 here who we're talking about. THE COURT: So if you were ultimately selected to be a 12 13 juror on the case, your disposition would be that you would be 14 prepared to do it notwithstanding the other issues going on? 15 Is that what I'm hearing or not? Tell me if that's not the 16 case. 17 THE JUROR: I think I would -- yes, I would be 18 prepared to do it. 19 THE COURT: We've been asking people about their use 03:00 20 of social media. You say you use Facebook about once a week, 21 something like that. 22 THE JUROR: Yeah. I try to avoid it but it's there, 23 so I use it once in a while. 24 THE COURT: Let me ask you to turn, if you would, to Page 20, Question 77 at the top. Here we asked whether, based 25

03:02 20

03:02 10

on things you'd seen or read in the media or that you had learned from other sources, had you formed an opinion about whether the defendant was guilty or not or should receive the death penalty or not, and you answered "unsure" to each of those subparts of the guestion. Can you tell us about that?

THE JUROR: Well, I just -- I put that because I'm not sure about his motivations and his psychological state and his relationship with his brother. I know what the media told me, but I don't know the whole story really so --

THE COURT: Well, you know from this morning, as I described it, the case, if it went the full distance, would have two phases. The first would be concerned with whether he's guilty of the crimes he's charged with or not; and the second phase, if he was guilty of a capital crime, whether the penalty should be a death sentence or life in prison without the possibility of release.

So focusing on the first phase, it's not surprising that people have learned things about these events from the media coverage. What we ask jurors in a criminal case to do though is first to presume that the defendant is innocent and require the government to prove to them by the evidence that he's guilty. The government's burden is to prove that beyond a reasonable doubt. So the burden is always on the government to carry that burden in order to obtain a conviction. You're familiar with those principles, I presume?

1 THE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Focusing on that first phase, would you be 2 able as a juror to perform those -- to perform your service in 3 4 accordance with those principles and require the government to 5 prove its case to you beyond a reasonable doubt? 6 THE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Without presuming the defendant guilty of 7 anything? 8 9 THE JUROR: Yes. 03:03 10 THE COURT: And we're going -- we'll turn to the death 11 penalty questions in a minute because there's a series about that. But I want to ask you about your answer to Question 80 12 13 at the bottom of that page. 14 THE JUROR: Uh-huh. 1.5 THE COURT: This is about a former coworker. 16 was she a coworker with you? Was that in your teaching? 17 THE JUROR: This was someone I worked with at 18 Montserrat College of Art. I was doing a free-lance writing 19 position for them where I was going in part time. And she told 03:03 20 me that she had this firsthand experience at the bombing. 21 THE COURT: When did you talk with her about that? 22 THE JUROR: It was last year around this time, I 23 quess. THE COURT: So it wasn't in the immediate aftermath? 24 25 It was sometime after that?

1 THE JUROR: No. It was after that. It was because I was working on a story for the college that involved a graphic 2 artist who designed T-shirts to -- like, a Boston Strong type 3 4 of T-shirt, and he was connected to the art school. So it came 5 up. 6 THE COURT: Is there anything more about this 7 conversation or what you know about her that you think we should know? 8 9 THE JUROR: No, I don't think -- I don't think 03:04 10 anything else. 11 THE COURT: On the next page, we asked about you or people close to you, whether you were affected -- that's 12 13 Question 81 -- whether you were personally affected in any way 14 by the events. For example, some people had to stay in on the -- you may recall the Friday. I quess you said "not 15 16 applicable." You weren't affected in any way? 17 THE JUROR: I live on the North Shore, and I -- it didn't affect me in the way that it affected people who were 18 19 living in Watertown or in the immediate area. 03:05 20 THE COURT: You made a contribution to the One Fund, 21 the next question? 22 THE JUROR: Yes, just one contribution, yeah. 23 THE COURT: So at Page 23, beginning at Question 88, 24 we ask a series of questions to get an idea of your views about 25 the death penalty. And Question 88 is a -- asks whether you

1 have any views on the death penalty in general, and you wrote, "I am against the death penalty." 2 THE JUROR: Right, yes, I am. 3 4 THE COURT: In the next question, we asked you to see 5 if you could select a number on a scale that kind of gauged 6 where you were, with 1 strongly opposed would be a circumstance where you believed that the death penalty should never be 7 imposed; and 10, at the other end, where you believed it should 8 9 be imposed whenever a defendant is convicted of murder. You selected 3. You think that's --03:06 10 11 THE JUROR: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Can you tell us why? THE JUROR: It's a difficult scale to work with 13 14 really. THE COURT: You're right about that. 15 16 THE JUROR: There's, like, these shades of -- I'm 17 against it just because I'm a pacifist, and I'm somebody who believes that everybody has the right to life. I'm against 18 19 abortion for the same reasons. It's -- I was raised in a 03:06 20 Christian household. So it's just what I was -- it's part of 21 my background. 22 THE COURT: If you look at Page 24, Question 90, this 23 is a little less clumsy than the previous numerical scale. 24 This asks you in words whether there was a statement that you 25 thought represented your views about the death penalty for

somebody convicted of murder. You chose (b). "I'm opposed to the death penalty and would have a difficult time voting to impose it even if the facts supported it."

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: I just want to see if there's a reason why, given what you've just said, you didn't choose (a).

THE JUROR: Well, I guess there's a shadow of a doubt in my mind. I've never been put in this position before where I had to -- you know, to vote, like, on something like this.

THE COURT: Right.

THE JUROR: You know, it's not a black and white for me. There's a little bit of a shade of gray.

THE COURT: So you heard me this morning describe what would be the penalty phase if the defendant was convicted of a capital crime, where the jury would be presented with evidence that might tend to show it was a particularly serious and blameworthy crime. That would be the aggravating factors by the government. And on the other hand, there might be mitigating factors about the defendant or other things about the events that might tend to argue against the death penalty and in favor of a life imprisonment. Then we'd ask the jurors to assess all that they had heard in the penalty phase and make a choice based on that evidence about what was the right punishment that each juror thought was appropriate.

Would you, in that process, be receptive to the

03:07 10

03:08 20

03:09 20

03:09 10

possibility that you could vote in either direction, or would you be, because of your opposition to the death penalty, pretty much disposed not to vote for the death penalty?

THE JUROR: I really -- it's a really -- it's hard to say. I mean, I -- I think it would take a lot to change my mind, frankly.

THE COURT: To change your mind?

THE JUROR: My conviction about the death penalty being wrong for anybody.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask you to look at the bottom of Page 25, Question 95. There, putting it in the context of this case, if you found this defendant guilty and decided that the death penalty was an appropriate -- was the appropriate punishment for him, could you conscientiously vote for the death penalty? And you wrote "not sure."

And if you want to look at the next question on the next page, kind of the parallel question. If you found him guilty and you decided life imprisonment without possibility of release was the appropriate punishment, could you conscientiously vote for life imprisonment without the possibility of release? And you said "yes" to that. So a little contrast between "yes" to that and "not sure" to the other. I just want to -- do you want to talk about that difference?

THE JUROR: It just is more clear-cut in my mind that

1 I feel now that life imprisonment would be the best punishment for him. I mean, it would take a lot for me to change my mind 2 3 on that. THE COURT: Okay. The lawyers will have some 4 5 follow-up questions. 6 MR. WEINREB: Good morning. 7 THE JUROR: Good morning. MR. WEINREB: My name is Bill Weinreb. I'm one of the 8 prosecutors in the case. I just wanted to ask you a few 9 03:10 10 additional questions. Turning back to Question 80, it's on 11 Page 20. 12 THE JUROR: Okay. 13 MR. WEINREB: You mentioned you were writing an 14 article at the time that your friend told you about her 15 experience. 16 THE JUROR: It was a -- it was a blog posting on an 17 alum from this art school who had gone on to start a graphic 18 arts business and who had made T-shirts for -- to raise money 19 for the Marathon victims. 03:11 20 MR. WEINREB: When you say it was a blog, is it --21 THE JUROR: A blog article. 22 MR. WEINREB: A blog article. 23 THE JUROR: Yeah, on the college website. 24 MR. WEINREB: Did you do research for the article? 25 THE JUROR: I interviewed the artist. That was all I

```
1
          did. And I looked at his website and saw that he had raised
          money for the Marathon victims. That was it.
     2
                   MR. WEINREB: Did the article talk about the victims
     3
          themselves or what he had done for them or --
     4
     5
                   THE JUROR: Nobody specifically.
                   MR. WEINREB: What exactly was it about; can you tell
     7
          us?
                   THE JUROR: My article?
     8
     9
                   MR. WEINREB: Yes.
03:11 10
                   THE JUROR: It was just a profile -- it was a success
    11
          story of somebody who graduated from this arts college and has
    12
          gone on to start a successful graphic arts business and focused
    13
          more on that.
    14
                   MR. WEINREB: Got you.
    15
                   On this issue of the death penalty --
    16
                   THE JUROR: Uh-huh.
    17
                   MR. WEINREB: So turning to your answer to Question
          88, how long has that been your view that you're against the
    18
    19
          death penalty?
03:12 20
                   THE JUROR: It's just sort of an engrained viewpoint
    21
          that I've held my whole life, I quess. I haven't ever had to
    22
          think about it in such a -- you know, a relevant way before but
    23
    24
                   MR. WEINREB: You mentioned that one reason you're
    25
          against it has to do with your religion.
```

1 THE JUROR: Uh-huh. MR. WEINREB: Can you say more about that? 2 THE JUROR: Well, I'm a Christian, and I believe that 3 4 life is a gift from God and that it's wrong for anybody to take 5 that away from somebody, whether it be murdering somebody, you 6 know, like in the Marathon bombing, or whether it be killing somebody who committed the crime of the Marathon bombing. I 7 think that killing somebody is wrong no matter what. 8 9 MR. WEINREB: When you say "wrong," by that do you 03:13 10 mean, like, immoral? 11 THE JUROR: Yes. MR. WEINREB: So -- and you extend that to taking --12 13 basically to sentencing somebody to death? That's taking 14 somebody's life in the same way that a murderer takes 15 somebody's life? 16 THE JUROR: Yes. I see them as one and the same, I quess. It just seems like it's punishing the crime with 17 18 another crime in my eyes. 19 MR. WEINREB: So if I understand you right, believing 03:14 20 that it's immoral, as you say, and that it's essentially like 21 murder to sentence somebody to death, can you really envision 22 yourself ever sentencing somebody to death? 23 THE JUROR: No, I really can't. Sitting here right 24 now in front of you and thinking about it, I can't imagine that 25 I could do that.

1 MR. WEINREB: Okay. So when you said earlier that you don't like to be black and white and that there's a sort of a 2 shadow of a doubt, were you saying that you're wavering in your 3 4 conviction as to whether the death penalty is immoral or not or 5 just that nobody can ever know anything? You can't be 100 6 percent certain about anything? THE JUROR: I guess I'm just -- I'm just thinking that 7 I don't know the whole story, and there's a part of me that 8 9 just -- maybe the journalist in me that just wants to hear --03:15 10 before I make a judgment call, to hear the whole story. 11 MR. WEINREB: Fair enough. So one of the things we're trying to figure out here though is whether -- whether your 12 13 moral views against the death penalty, your belief that it's 14 like murder to sentence someone to death, whether that would 15 really impair your ability to realistically consider you 16 personally putting somebody to death even if the evidence were 17 strong in your mind. 18 THE JUROR: Right. 19 MR. WEINREB: Can you answer that for us? Do you 03:15 20 think that it would impair you in the sense that in any 21 case you would be --22 MR. BRUCK: Objection. I think -- impairment is a 23 legal issue. THE COURT: I'm not sure the juror understands it as a 24 25 legal matter. I think you can answer that in the plain English

1 sense of the word. There is some legal gloss on it, but I think you can have it as a plain English guestion. 2 MR. WEINREB: In other words --3 THE JUROR: No. I understand. I'm just thinking. 4 5 MR. WEINREB: Yeah. 6 THE JUROR: I really -- I don't think -- I think any 7 conviction should be questioned. I mean, I don't see myself as a close-minded person, so that's why I didn't put the black or 8 9 white, one end of the scale or the other. I mean, I don't 03:16 10 know. I might change my mind about it. 11 MR. WEINREB: Well, again, I realize we're talking about things that are -- it's hard to predict how you would 12 13 feel about something in the future, but this is our one chance

to ask you and sort of get a sense of your best judgment on the issue. And that's why I'm pressing it a bit.

And what I'm really trying to get at, and my question is, when you say you don't like to be black or white or you

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

03:17 20

don't want to be 100 percent one way or the other way, can you really envision yourself giving up this -- or setting aside this conviction that the death penalty is immoral and is like murder and sentencing someone to death regardless of the evidence that you heard?

THE JUROR: I think it would take a lot. That's all I can say. It would really -- it would take a lot to change my mind.

```
1
                   MR. WEINREB: And what -- can you envision --
                   THE JUROR: I don't know. I really don't know what
     2
          this case is about.
     3
     4
                   MR. WEINREB: I'm not talking about this case. I'm
     5
          just talking about any case. Can you envision circumstances
     6
          that would change your mind?
                   THE JUROR: I already answered. I don't -- I really
     7
          -- I don't know. Maybe --
     8
     9
                   MR. WEINREB: I'm asking --
                   THE JUROR: Yes, maybe. Maybe I could envision
03:18 10
    11
          something that would make me change my mind.
                   MR. WEINREB: What would you envision that could
    12
    13
          change your mind?
    14
                   THE JUROR: The idea of spending your life in prison
    1.5
          isn't that much more fulfilling than being killed in a way. I
    16
          mean, I don't know.
    17
                   MR. WEINREB: I mean, you can take a moment and think
          about it.
    18
    19
                   THE JUROR: Is he going to be up for parole at all?
03:18 20
          Is there a chance that he might get out of prison and have a
          life for himself? Are we talking about, like, he's going into
    21
          prison for the rest of his life with no chance for parole?
    22
    23
                   MR. WEINREB: The latter.
    24
                   THE JUROR: That's it. There's no room.
    25
                   MR. WEINREB: No room. Those are the two options:
```

death or the life without any possibility of release.

03:19 20

03:19 10

THE JUROR: Then, in my mind, there's more room for the death penalty because it almost changes my viewpoint.

MR. WEINREB: Okay. But what I'm asking here is a slightly different question, which is, can you envision a crime that would be so bad or circumstances about a murder that would be so bad that it would justify murdering somebody else, the defendant?

MR. BRUCK: Objection to "murdering somebody else."

MR. WEINREB: Just using the defendant -- the juror's own words.

THE JUROR: I think you're just asking me the same question over and over again.

MR. WEINREB: I'm trying to actually get you to tell use what the circumstances would be that would -- what would be a heinous enough crime in your mind, if any?

example, right now, just looking at the case as I've seen in the media, I see it as something where he's a young -- he's a younger brother and that he was influenced by his older brother and that -- as I'm looking at it now, I'm seeing it as that the older brother was more of the mastermind. But in the course of the trial, something swayed me and changed my mind and I, you know, I learned that he was more of the mastermind in the trial, perhaps there would be more of a sense that he deserves

```
1
          something like that. As things stand now, I would not vote for
          the death penalty, and I would -- I don't know. I mean, it's
     2
          sad to me even that there's not a chance of parole for him but
     3
          -- but I -- that's --
     4
     5
                   MR. WEINREB: You know you're here for this case, and
     6
          so you keep answering about this case, and that's perfectly
          understandable. There's nothing wrong with that.
     7
                    I'd like to ask you though a slightly different
     8
     9
          question which has to do with any case, not this case. Putting
03:20 10
          aside this case, can you imagine circumstances under which
    11
          somebody who had committed a murder should be sentenced to
    12
          death?
    13
                   MR. BRUCK: I think that's been asked and answered.
    14
                   THE JUROR: I've already told you.
    1.5
                   THE COURT: I think we've been over it.
    16
                   MR. WEINREB: Excuse me one second.
                   THE COURT: Yeah.
    17
           (Discussion held off the record.)
    18
    19
                   MR. WEINREB: Okay. Thanks very much.
03:21 20
                   THE COURT: Go ahead.
    21
                   MR. BRUCK: When we started, it would have been good
    22
          morning, but it's now good afternoon.
    23
                   THE JUROR: Good afternoon.
    24
                   MR. BRUCK: I'm David Bruck, and I'm one of Jahar
    25
          Tsarnaev's lawyers.
```

03:23 20

03:22 10

I know you've been asked a lot of questions about this, but I just want to see if we can get some clarity at the end. You said that the journalist in you has a response to the situation of curiosity. What I think we're really asking is whether there's a juror in you by which the law means someone who can put their personal views, no matter how strong, to one side, not forget about them or change them but just put them to one side and be guided by the evidence in the case.

That's what this is about, and that's what I want to ask you. On the issue of the death penalty, understanding your strongly held views, could you put your views to one side and serve as an impartial juror that -- by which we mean paying attention to the evidence in favor of the death penalty, the evidence against the death penalty, and make your decision based on the evidence in the case.

THE JUROR: No, I don't -- I don't think I could. I think that my viewpoint is too much of a conviction for me.

MR. BRUCK: Just to be clear about one last thing -and I won't belabor this -- but a juror never has to vote for
the death penalty. It's not as though there are some facts,
once proven, the judge will say, All right. That's it, jury.
Go out and come back with the death penalty. In the end, the
jurors always have to make and get to make their own decision
one at a time, individually. So -- and if your decision was
that the death penalty was not the right thing to do, you would

```
1
          always be legally allowed to do it. So I don't want you to --
                   MR. WEINREB: Objection, your Honor.
     2
                   THE COURT: Yeah.
                                      I think we need a question.
     3
     4
                   MR. BRUCK: The question is: Understanding that you
     5
          could always vote one way or the other based on the evidence --
     6
          that was really what I was asking -- could you go for the death
     7
          penalty or against the death penalty based on the evidence in
     8
          the case?
     9
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
03:23 10
                   MR. BRUCK: Okay. There was a difference between the
    11
          answer you gave me and the one --
                   THE JUROR: Well, the question seemed different to me.
    12
    13
                   MR. BRUCK: Tell me.
    14
                   THE JUROR: You're saying that I could still vote for
          the death penalty if I felt like it was the right choice.
    15
    16
                   MR. BRUCK: Right, or for life if you thought that was
          the right choice.
    17
    18
                   THE JUROR: Right. How does it work if -- if one
    19
          person votes against the death penalty in the jury, then what
03:24 20
          happens?
    21
                   MR. BRUCK: It has to be unanimous for the death
    22
          penalty or there's no death penalty.
    23
                   THE JUROR: Right, okay. So my answer --
                   MR. BRUCK: Is?
    24
    25
                   THE JUROR: -- stands that I -- if I could still keep
```

```
my conviction -- I honestly don't know if anything would change
     1
          my mind or not. But as things stand now, I feel that the death
     2
          penalty is wrong, but there's a chance that I might change my
     3
     4
          mind.
     5
                   MR. BRUCK: You'd change your mind based on what? On
     6
          the evidence in the case?
                   THE JUROR: Uh-huh.
     7
                   MR. WEINREB: Objection, your Honor.
     8
     9
                   THE COURT: All right.
03:25 10
                   THE JUROR: Sorry. I don't know if I was clear on
    11
          this.
                   MR. BRUCK: No. I appreciate it.
    12
    13
                   THE COURT: Thank you very much. You're all set.
    14
          Thanks.
    15
                   THE CLERK: Juror No. 447.
    16
                   THE JURY CLERK: Juror 447.
    17
                   THE CLERK: Ma'am, over here, please, if you would.
    18
          Have a seat.
    19
                   THE COURT: Good afternoon.
03:26 20
                   THE JUROR: Good afternoon.
    21
                   THE COURT: Since you were here last to fill out the
    22
          questionnaire, have you been able to avoid any discussion of
    23
          the case?
    24
                   THE JUROR: Yes, I have.
    25
                   THE COURT: And, as much as possible, any media
```

```
1
          reports about it?
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
     2
                   THE COURT: So we're just going to follow up on some
     3
     4
          of the answers you gave us. Let's start by talking about your
     5
          work. You are, it looks like, an office --
     6
                   THE JUROR: Administrative assistant for the
          Department of Executive Office of Work Force Development.
     7
     8
                   THE COURT: Okay. The usual office-type work?
     9
                   THE JUROR: Phone calls, answering the phones, faxing,
03:27 10
          anything else that needs to be done.
    11
                   THE COURT: Okay. You've been doing that for?
    12
                   THE JUROR: Fourteen years.
    13
                   THE COURT: Yeah, quite awhile. You would have no
    14
          difficulty if you were asked to serve on a lengthy case like
    1.5
          this?
    16
                   THE JUROR: The only difficulty I would have is my
    17
                 I'm a single parent to two girls. So there would be
    18
          some difficulty there, but other than that --
    19
                   THE COURT: Is it manageable or is it something --
03:27 20
                   THE JUROR: My parents help me out.
    21
                   THE COURT: Are they local?
    22
                   THE JUROR: They are, yes.
    23
                   THE COURT: You know that the normal trial day would
          be 9 to 4. It wouldn't be an unusual --
    24
    25
                   THE JUROR: Yup, that would be reasonable.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. I don't know how significant it is, but we've been asking people about their use of social media. 2 You use Facebook --3 4 THE JUROR: I do. 5 THE COURT: -- on a daily basis almost? THE JUROR: I do, yes. THE COURT: Family and friends kind of things? THE JUROR: Yes. 8 9 THE COURT: Any other use? 03:28 10 THE JUROR: No. 11 THE COURT: Let me ask you to look at Page 20. 12 it's easier for you to deal with it, you can take the clip off 13 and separate the -- Question 77, near the top of the page, 14 there we asked whether, based on things you'd seen or read in 1.5 the media or learned from other sources, had you formed an 16 opinion that the defendant was guilty or not or that he should receive the death penalty or not. And to Part (a) you answered 17 "no." And to the other parts you answered "unsure." Could you 18 19 tell us about your answers? 03:29 20 THE JUROR: I think -- I think that every case is 21 different, and I think that, unless you hear all the 22 information and you need to hear everything in the case before 23 you can make a decision if someone is quilty or if they're 24 innocent. Not every case is black and white. There's a lot of 25 things that go on.

1 THE COURT: So you understand, I'm sure, that in our criminal justice system, if a person is accused of a crime, the 2 person is presumed innocent of that crime --3 4 THE JUROR: Yes. 5 THE COURT: -- unless and until the government proves 6 otherwise -- proves him quilty at the trial by the evidence at 7 trial and proves it beyond a reasonable doubt. Those are familiar concepts to you? 8 9 THE JUROR: Uh-huh. 03:30 10 THE COURT: It's not surprising people have heard 11 about things -- about the events that underlie this case and 12 have some impressions about it. What we ask jurors to do is to 13 set those ideas aside and pay attention to the body of evidence 14 that's produced in the course of the trial and make judgments 15 about that. Would you be able to do that? 16 THE JUROR: Yes. 17 THE COURT: If the government, on any given charge, 18 failed to satisfy you beyond a reasonable doubt that the 19 defendant was guilty of that charge, would you be able to vote 03:30 20 not quilty? 21 THE JUROR: Yes. 22 THE COURT: On Page 21, we asked a couple of questions 23 about whether you or anybody close to you were personally 24 affected by the events of the Marathon bombings. You said 25 "none." No personal impact on you?

1 THE JUROR: No, uh-umm. THE COURT: You didn't participate in any of the 2 after-the-fact support activities, One Fund, Boston Strong or 3 4 anything like that? 5 THE JUROR: Nope. 6 THE COURT: So beginning at Page 23, Question 88, we asked a series of questions about jurors' attitudes about the 7 death penalty, so I want to run through those. 88 was itself a 8 9 general question. If you had general views, what were they? 03:31 10 You wrote that each criminal has different circumstances, and 11 this case should, I guess, look at all the evidence. 12 THE JUROR: Yeah. 13 THE COURT: Tell me -- wait a minute. 14 THE JUROR: Sorry. 15 THE COURT: There were a couple of crossouts. 16 don't you read it for us. THE JUROR: "Each criminal is different circumstances 17 and that this case should have -- look at all the evidence 18 19 before the sentence of death came up. And before I made a 03:31 20 decision, I would have to look at everything and listen to 21 everything." 22 THE COURT: Let's step away from what you wrote. Tell 23 us what your general views about the death penalty are. 24 THE JUROR: The same thing, that each case is 25 different, that each criminal is different, and that, you know,

03:33 20

03:32 10

depending on what the evidence shows, that's how I would base my decision on, not on what I've heard or what I've seen or anything else.

THE COURT: Okay. In the next question, we asked if you could put yourself on a scale, this is -- no, Question 89 -- from 1 to 10, with 1 being strongly opposed, would never vote to impose the death penalty; and, strongly favor, would always vote to impose the death penalty when someone was convicted of murder. You put yourself somewhere in the middle.

THE JUROR: Because I'm not really sure where I stand on that. I'm not going to say that I think it should be. I'm not going to say I'm strongly opposed to it. I'm in the middle of it.

THE COURT: Now, let's go to the next page, Question 90. There we ask a little differently by giving you a number of statements you might agree or disagree with and asked if one of those represented fairly your own views about the imposition of the death penalty in a case where someone has been guilty of murder. You chose (d). It says, "I'm not for or against the death penalty. I could impose it or I could vote to impose a sentence of life imprisonment without the possibility of release, whichever I believed was called for by the facts and the law in the case.

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Does that represent your view?

1 THE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: If you go to the next page, 25, at the 2 bottom, Question 95, we put it in the context of this case now. 3 If you found this defendant quilty and you decided that the 4 5 death penalty was the appropriate punishment for him, could you 6 conscientiously vote for the death penalty? You said "not sure." 7 THE JUROR: I honestly don't know if I can do that. 8 That's somebody's life that you're playing with. I don't 9 03:33 10 really know if I could honestly put him to death. 11 THE COURT: Notice that the question says that -- the 12 assumption in the question is that you've decided that the 13 death penalty is appropriate for him. 14 THE JUROR: I'm still very unsure. 15 THE COURT: I just wanted to call that to your 16 attention. 17 Now, if you go to the next question, it's kind of a parallel question. If you found the defendant guilty and you 18 19 decided that life imprisonment without the possibility of 03:34 20 release was the appropriate punishment, could you 21 conscientiously vote for that? You said "not sure" to that as 22 well. 23 THE JUROR: Yeah. Honestly, on both of those, I do not know if I could --24 25 THE COURT: When you say you don't know, you don't

1 know whether you would -- could do it in good conscience, or you don't know whether you could make up your mind about which 2 was the better choice? 3 4 THE JUROR: Yes, which -- at the time. I'm not --5 THE COURT: I explained this morning in brief terms 6 the process. If there were a conviction of a capital crime, that we'd proceed to the penalty phase, and there would be 7 evidence of what we call aggravating factors, and there would 8 9 be evidence of mitigating factors, and they would have to be 03:35 10 balanced. Could you make a judgment about which penalty was 11 appropriate, if you were at that stage, based on an evaluation of that evidence? 12 13 THE JUROR: Would have to, yes. 14 MR. WEINREB: Thank you, your Honor. Good afternoon. 15 THE JUROR: Hi. 16 MR. WEINREB: My name is Bill Weinreb. I'm one of the 17 prosecutors in the case. I'm not sure I understood all of your answers at the 18 19 end about the death penalty questions. So if you don't mind, I'd like to ask you a few more to clear it up. 03:35 20 21 THE JUROR: Sure. 22 MR. WEINREB: So if -- at the very end you said that 23 -- in your answers to the final two questions that you --24 you're unsure about which way you would go. But I want to put 25 aside this case entirely and just ask you in general about

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

03:37 20

03:36 10

serving on a jury where a defendant is potentially subject to the death sentence. So we're not talking about this defendant. And the question there is: If you -- can you envision cases where the circumstances could convince you that the death penalty was an appropriate sentence for an intentional murder? THE JUROR: If there was such a case and the evidence shown proved beyond a reasonable doubt that he -- that the death penalty was the way to go, then, yes, I would vote for that particular way to go. MR. WEINREB: Okay. What about the other? If the evidence showed --THE JUROR: If it showed that life imprisonment was

the way to go, then I would be voting for life imprisonment.

MR. WEINREB: Okay. Just to make sure that we're on the same page, you understand that the way that it works in the federal system is that, if a defendant is found guilty of an intentional murder, there's no automatic penalty one way or the other at that point. There's a whole second phase of the trial.

THE JUROR: I understand that.

MR. WEINREB: At that trial you'd hear evidence, and the government would try -- would offer evidence that it believes made the death sentence the appropriate sentence. defense would offer evidence that it believes made life imprisonment the appropriate sentence. And there's no formula

1 for figuring out which is the right way to go. You, as a juror, are personally called upon to weigh all the evidence, 2 consider it all together, and make a judgment at the end about 3 4 what you believe is the right sentence. 5 THE COURT: You're doing a little bit about what 6 you've criticized Mr. Bruck for doing. 7 MR. WEINREB: Here I'm not trying to lead to any particular answer. Generally just trying to ask --8 9 THE COURT: Let's get to the question. 03:38 10 MR. WEINREB: -- whether you could do that. 11 THE JUROR: Yes, I could. 12 MR. WEINREB: If you determined that the death 13 sentence was the appropriate sentence, could you actually do 14 it, sentence someone to death, knowing that it was a decision 15 you could never take back? 16 THE JUROR: Knowing that was the decision that I could never take back, again, that's somebody's life we're playing 17 with. Even though he's been found guilty and the person has 18 19 been sentenced to death, I -- that, I have -- you know, I'm 03:38 20 unsure of because it's somebody's life. 21 MR. WEINREB: Okay. So you've never been in that 22 situation before. 23 THE JUROR: No, I haven't. 24 MR. WEINREB: It's impossible to know from experience. 25 So we're just -- we're left to ask you what your prediction is

of your ability.

```
MR. BRUCK: I think he's asked, and we have the
     2
     3
          answer.
                   THE COURT: He can have it. This is the last one. Go
     4
     5
          ahead. Answer the question.
     6
                   THE JUROR: I would have to really weigh everything
          and really think about it before I would be able to make that
     7
          decision. Again, it's somebody's life we're playing with
     8
     9
          regardless of the fact that they've been found quilty.
03:39 10
                   MR. WEINREB: Okay. And if you weighed it and made
    11
          the decision and you came to the decision that a death sentence
          was the appropriate sentence, could you take the next step and
    12
    13
          actually give the sentence?
    14
                   MS. CLARKE: I think that's been --
    1.5
                   THE JUROR: I'm undecided on that. I'm sorry. I'm
    16
          very undecided on that.
    17
                   THE COURT: We'll leave it at that. That's the answer
    18
          you're going to get, I think. Is that it?
    19
                   MR. WEINREB: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. Thank you.
03:39 20
                   MS. CLARKE: My name is Judy Clarke. I'm one of the
    21
          lawyers for Mr. Tsarnaev. Good afternoon.
    22
                   THE JUROR: Good afternoon.
    23
                   MS. CLARKE: If you'll bear with me just for a few
    24
          questions.
    25
                   THE JUROR: Sure.
```

1 MS. CLARKE: The jury is expected to do a couple of things in a capital case. After finding the accused guilty of 2 the crime beyond a reasonable doubt, there's a penalty phase. 3 And all the law requires of a juror is to fairly consider all 4 5 of the evidence presented and to listen to it and deliberate about it. Can you do those things? 6 THE JUROR: Yes, I can. 7 MS. CLARKE: And recognizing in a capital case that no 8 9 juror is ever required to vote for a death sentence but what a 03:40 10 juror is required to do is give fair consideration to both 11 options: life in prison without parole or death. Could you do 12 that? 13 THE JUROR: I could, yes. 14 MS. CLARKE: And then the third thing that the juror 1.5 has to do, be able to do, is to assure Judge that once that 16 juror makes up his or her mind that they could follow through 17 on their conscience. If their conscience said that a sentence of life in prison without parole was the right way to go, 18 19 that's what they would vote for. 03:41 20 THE JUROR: Yes. 21 MS. CLARKE: You could do that? 22 THE JUROR: Yes. 23 MS. CLARKE: If their conscience said that the right 24 way to go in that particular case was a death sentence, could 25 you follow through on that third obligation as a juror?

```
1
                   THE JUROR: Again, I'm very unsure on that. I would
          have to weigh everything in my conscience and really take a
     2
          look at my conscience and really think about that.
     3
                   MS. CLARKE: Well, I think why we're spending just a
     4
     5
          little extra time allowing you to think fast about that
     6
          because, obviously, since January the -- whatever day you came
          in, the 5th, I guess -- you've probably given it some
     7
          consideration, right?
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: I have, but, you know, again, my stance
03:41 10
          has been it's somebody's life, and I just don't know if I could
    11
          make that conscious decision to put them to death. I honestly
          -- even though he's been found quilty and that's what they gave
    12
    13
          him, I honestly don't know if I could do that.
    14
                   MS. CLARKE: Thank you.
                   THE JUROR: You're welcome.
    1.5
    16
                   THE COURT: All right. That's it. Thank you.
                   THE JUROR: Thank you very much.
    17
                   THE CLERK: Juror No. 448.
    18
    19
                   THE JURY CLERK: Juror 448.
                   THE CLERK: Ma'am, over here, please. Have a seat.
03:44 20
    21
                   THE COURT: Good afternoon.
    22
                   THE JUROR: Good afternoon.
    23
                   THE COURT: Have you been able to avoid talking about
    24
          the case since we were last here?
    25
                   THE JUROR: I have been. I didn't talk to anybody.
                                                                         Ι
```

1 mean, if it happened to be on television, I kind of walked out of the room. 2 THE COURT: Right. So we're going to follow up on 3 some of the answers you gave in the questionnaire. 4 THE JUROR: Okay. 5 6 THE COURT: I want to start with, on Page 10, Question 7 26, where we asked for your employment. You said you are an estate manager. Can you tell us what that is? 8 9 THE JUROR: Yes. This was for a private residence. I 03:44 10 took care of this man and his wife for about 20 years. And 11 when she passed away, she asked me to continue taking care of 12 him, whatever he needed, and --13 THE COURT: So you managed the household? Is that 14 what you do? THE JUROR: He had quite a lot of property. He had a 15 16 big ranch in Colorado. He had a lot of stocks. I mean, I had a staff of, like, ten to twelve people. Whatever he needed, 17 18 basically, that was -- but I was working at a hospital, at the 19 Winchester Hospital. 03:45 20 THE COURT: Right, right. 21 THE JUROR: Then they asked me to leave that job to do 22 this. 23 THE COURT: You've been putting it in the past tense. 24 Are you still doing it? 25 THE JUROR: No. I retired in October.

```
1
                   THE COURT: All right. Okay. Congratulations.
                   THE JUROR: Thanks.
     2
                               When you were doing it, were you -- he was
     3
                   THE COURT:
     4
          based here, but he had properties elsewhere, is that it?
     5
                   THE JUROR: He did.
     6
                   THE COURT: So you would travel around?
     7
                   THE JUROR: I did not have to travel, but if I had to
          I would have.
     8
     9
                   THE COURT: All right. So now you're a woman of
03:46 10
          leisure, is that it?
    11
                   THE JUROR: I was. I was heading for Florida in
    12
          January, but -- that's okay.
    13
                   THE COURT: Well, you've got to enjoy all the snow.
    14
                   THE JUROR: Oh, yeah, my first year out. I won't
    15
          forget it.
    16
                   THE COURT: Okay. I just want to turn to Question 77
    17
          on Page 10 -- 10? 20, Page 20. In Question 77, we asked
          whether, based on things you'd seen or heard in the media or
    18
    19
          from other sources, you had formed an opinion about whether the
03:46 20
          defendant was quilty or not and what the penalty should be.
    21
          You indicated by checking the boxes that you had an opinion
    22
          formed that he was guilty but that you were unsure of the
    23
          penalty, correct?
    24
                   THE JUROR: Right.
    25
                   THE COURT: In the second part of the question, if you
```

1 look at it, we asked, If you answered yes to any of those questions -- and you answered yes to Part (a) -- would you be 2 able or unable to set aside your opinion and base your decision 3 4 about quilt based solely on the evidence presented in court? 5 And you checked "able." 6 THE JUROR: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Can you tell us about that? THE JUROR: I believe that people have to -- you have 8 9 to prove that he's innocent or guilty. Everybody has a fair 03:47 10 chance. Nobody was born -- come into this world being bad. I 11 just think everybody should have a fair chance. 12 THE COURT: Okay. As I'm sure you know, in a criminal 13 prosecution, a person accused of a crime is presumed to be 14 innocent of the crime unless the government proves that he's 15 quilty by the evidence at trial and proves it to the jury 16 beyond a reasonable doubt. 17 THE JUROR: Yes. 18 THE COURT: You're familiar with those concepts? 19 THE JUROR: Yes. 03:48 20 THE COURT: What we'd ask a juror to do in a criminal 21 case is pay attention to the evidence in the case and make 22 judgments about the various charges that may be made based on 23 that evidence and not based on ideas that they might have from 24 other sources.

THE JUROR: Yes.

25

1 THE COURT: If you were a juror in this case, would you be able to do that? 2 3 THE JUROR: Yes, I would. THE COURT: And the burden of proof, of course, is 4 5 always on the government to prove a person guilty. A defendant 6 in a criminal case never has a burden to prove that he's not 7 quilty. It's up to the government to prove its proposition in a sense. 8 9 THE JUROR: Uh-huh. 03:48 10 THE COURT: If, on any of the charges, you thought 11 that the government had not fulfilled that -- had not carried that burden and had failed to convince you beyond a reasonable 12 13 doubt that the defendant was quilty of that particular charge, 14 would you be able to vote not guilty under those circumstances? 15 THE JUROR: Yes. 16 THE COURT: Let me just ask you to go to the next 17 page. 18 THE JUROR: 21? 19 THE COURT: We asked about whether you had personally 03:49 20 been affected -- that's Question 81 -- by the Marathon events. 21 You said "no." 22 THE JUROR: No. 23 THE COURT: And in the next one -- there were various 24 support activities after the events: the One Fund and Boston 25 Strong and so on and so forth.

```
1
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
                   THE COURT: You said you purchased a shirt and a
     2
          Boston Strong magnet. Can you just tell us --
     3
     4
                   THE JUROR: I'm a Red Sox ticket holder, so I go to
     5
          many Red Sox games. I just happened to not go to that game
     6
          that day. So I did go to one a few times later, and they were
     7
          selling the shirts and --
                   THE COURT: What shirts were they?
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: It says "Boston Strong" on them.
03:49 10
                   THE COURT: They weren't Red Sox shirts? That's what
    11
          I was getting at.
    12
                   THE JUROR: No. They were Boston Strong shirts, but I
    13
          bought them at the Red Sox game and the little magnets that go
    14
          in your car.
    1.5
                   THE COURT: That was a short time after the events?
    16
                   THE JUROR: I --
    17
                   THE COURT: Later in April maybe?
    18
                   THE JUROR: Well, I know that when I took the train in
    19
          that the crime scene tape was still up, so we couldn't go near
03:50 20
          there.
                  So it was in that time frame.
                   THE COURT: You know that the equipment truck has left
    21
    22
          for Florida?
    23
                   THE JUROR: I know. I saw it yesterday. I wasn't on
    24
          it.
    25
                   THE COURT: On Page 23, beginning at Question 88, we
```

```
1
          asked a series of questions about jurors' attitudes towards the
          death penalty. 88 itself was a -- asked, if you had any
     2
          general views, what were they. And you said, "I believe the
     3
     4
          death penalty should be used depending on the crime, example,
     5
          serial killer or rapist." Is that what that says?
     6
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
                                "Anyone who would like to relive the
     7
                   THE COURT:
          crimes."
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: Right.
03:51 10
                   THE COURT:
                               "All of the crimes depends on the
    11
          circumstances."
    12
                   THE JUROR: Correct.
    13
                   THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to amplify on that at
    14
          all?
    15
                   THE JUROR: Well, somebody like -- well, I put down a
    16
          serial killer or a rapist. Somebody who would enjoy reliving
    17
          that crime I think should then spend the rest of their life in
          jail -- should not, should get the death penalty so they would
    18
    19
          not enjoy reliving it. Somebody who, let's say, killed a
03:51 20
          police officer or somebody didn't plan it or -- I think life
    21
          imprisonment. So it depends on the case.
    22
                   THE COURT: Uh-huh. In the next question, we asked if
    23
          you could think about putting a number on a scale to match your
    24
          views. You chose No. 10, which, as the question says,
          "reflects the belief that the death penalty should be imposed
    25
```

```
whenever the defendant has been convicted of intentional
     1
          murder."
     2
     3
                   THE JUROR: Maybe I just didn't understand.
                   THE COURT: That seems a little more --
     4
     5
                   THE JUROR: Right. I'm not very good at taking tests.
     6
          This was like a test.
                   THE COURT: Let's go to the next question, which,
     7
          rather than using numbers, puts it in words.
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: Okay.
03:52 10
                   THE COURT: There was a series of propositions.
    11
          asked if you could find one that reflected your feelings about
    12
          the death penalty when somebody has been convicted of murder.
    13
          You actually selected two.
    14
                   THE JUROR: Okay.
    1.5
                   THE COURT: (d) and (e). Is that because you
    16
          weren't --
    17
                   THE JUROR: Let me see what it says.
    18
                   THE COURT: Go ahead. Read it.
    19
                   THE JUROR: (d) is the -- actually the answer to the
03:53 20
          previous question, the other page when I said depending on the
    21
          type of crime it was.
    22
                   THE COURT: Okay.
    23
                   THE JUROR: Let me see. (e), again, same thing.
    24
                   THE COURT: Okay. So now correct me if I'm wrong. I
    25
          don't want to put words in your mouth.
```

1 THE JUROR: Okay. THE COURT: Is it your position then, based on those 2 answers, that you would make up your mind, if you were in the 3 penalty phase of a case, which -- whether the death penalty or 4 5 life imprisonment without possibility of release was the right 6 punishment, would you make your mind up after you had considered all the --7 THE JUROR: Yes. 8 9 THE COURT: -- penalty phase information that you had 03:53 10 gotten in the course of that? 11 THE JUROR: Yes, I would. 12 THE COURT: Without any necessary predisposition to 13 one view or the other? 14 THE JUROR: No. 15 THE COURT: Let me ask you to go to the next page, 16 bottom of the page, Question 95. We put it in the context of this case. If you found the defendant quilty and you decided 17 18 that the death penalty was the appropriate punishment for him, 19 could you conscientiously vote for the death penalty? And you 03:54 20 said "yes." 21 THE JUROR: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Then if you go to the top of the next, we 23 asked a similar question. If you found him quilty and you 24 decided life in prison without the possibility of release was 25 the appropriate punishment for him, could you conscientiously

```
vote for that sentence? And you said "yes."
     1
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
     2
                   THE COURT: So, okay. I'll just leave it at that.
     3
                   THE JUROR: Whatever the jury decided would be a --
     4
     5
                   THE COURT: You understand you don't have to do what
          the other jurors do?
     7
                   THE JUROR: I understand, yes. But I would put my
          feelings forth.
     8
     9
                   THE COURT: You would be open to either?
                   THE JUROR: Either/or.
03:54 10
    11
                   MR. WEINREB: I have nothing, your Honor. Thank you.
    12
                   MS. CONRAD: Good afternoon, ma'am. My name is Miriam
    13
          Conrad. I'm one of Mr. Tsarnaev's lawyers.
    14
                   How long have you been a Red Sox season ticket holder?
    1.5
                   THE JUROR: About 15 years.
    16
                   MS. CONRAD: So the game that you went to after the
          Marathon bombing, was there a ceremony or any events honoring
    17
          the Marathon bombing victims?
    18
    19
                   THE JUROR: I was not at that game. You mean when
03:55 20
          they brought in the victims?
    2.1
                   MS. CONRAD: Well, was there any acknowledgment --
    22
                   THE JUROR: I don't remember.
    23
                   MS. CONRAD: Was it the game where David Ortiz made
    24
          his famous statement that I can't repeat?
    25
                   THE JUROR: No. Wait a minute. Maybe. It could have
```

```
1
          been. You know, if I'm not at the game, I'm watching it on TV.
                   MS. CONRAD: Sure.
     2
                   THE JUROR: So I could say yes and then I could be
     3
     4
          wrong so --
                   MS. CONRAD: But there was a lot of emotion.
     5
                   THE JUROR: Oh, yes, there was.
     7
                   MS. CONRAD: And how did that affect you?
                   THE JUROR: I cried.
     8
                   MS. CONRAD: On the anniversary, I think it was -- I
     9
03:56 10
          don't remember if it was Opening Day of 2014 when the --
    11
                   MR. WEINREB: Objection, your Honor.
    12
                   MS. CONRAD: I'm getting to the question.
    13
                   MR. WEINREB: A question would be more appropriate
    14
          than --
                   MS. CONRAD: Were you present when the World Series
    15
    16
          rings were presented --
    17
                   THE JUROR: No.
                   MS. CONRAD: -- by Marathon bombing victims?
    18
    19
                   THE JUROR: No.
03:56 20
                   MS. CONRAD: Did you watch that on TV?
    21
                   THE JUROR: I could have, but I could have also been
    22
          in Florida. I don't remember.
    23
                   MS. CONRAD: Okay. Let me just ask generally. On how
    24
          many occasions that you either watched a Red Sox game or
    25
          attended a Red Sox game was there some acknowledgement of the
```

```
1
          Marathon bombing events?
                   THE JUROR: Well, last year I only went to four, and I
     2
          get 13. So I'd say maybe -- out of the four, maybe one or two.
     3
     4
                   MS. CONRAD: Do you remember anything about what those
     5
          events were?
                   MR. WEINREB: Objection.
                   THE COURT: Yeah. I think -- I don't think we --
     7
                   MS. CONRAD: Well, let me ask this question: You said
     8
          that you didn't go to the game on April 15, 2013, the Patriots'
     9
03:57 10
          Day game.
    11
                   THE JUROR: No, I did not.
    12
                   MS. CONRAD: Did you know anybody who did?
    13
                   THE JUROR: Probably the other owners of those
    14
          tickets.
                   MS. CONRAD: Did you speak with them about what their
    15
          experience was like that day?
    16
    17
                   THE JUROR: No, I did not because I don't see these
    18
          people again till the following year at draft.
    19
                   MS. CONRAD: Did you have any concerns about their
03:57 20
          safety that day?
    21
                   THE JUROR: I did not.
    22
                   MS. CONRAD: Do you remember where you were that day?
    23
                   THE JUROR: Actually, I was taking care of my boss at
          the time.
    24
    25
                   MS. CONRAD: I'm sorry?
```

```
1
                   THE JUROR: I was taking care of my boss at the time.
                   MS. CONRAD: Do you remember how you found out about
     2
     3
          the bombing?
                   THE JUROR: On television.
     4
     5
                   MS. CONRAD: What do you remember about that?
     6
                   THE JUROR: Just that there had been an explosion at
          the finish line, and then it was just constant TV about it.
     7
     8
                   MS. CONRAD: How did you feel?
                   THE JUROR: It's hard to say. You feel numb. You
     9
03:58 10
          don't know -- believe it or not, the one feeling I did have was
    11
          I felt guilty.
    12
                   MS. CONRAD: Why?
    13
                   THE JUROR: I wasn't there.
    14
                   MS. CONRAD: Can you tell me more about that?
                   MR. WEINREB: Objection, your Honor. This isn't
    15
    16
          follow-up on any --
                   THE COURT: Yeah. Let's stick with the main event
    17
    18
          here.
    19
                   MS. CONRAD: Well, I think, respectfully, your Honor,
          this is.
03:58 20
    21
                   THE COURT: No.
    22
                   MS. CONRAD: Were you affected by the shelter in place
    23
          on April 19th?
    24
                   THE JUROR: Was I affected by what?
    25
                   MS. CONRAD: The shelter in place on April 19th.
```

1

THE JUROR: No, I was not. MS. CONRAD: Now, you selected on your questionnaire, 2 on Page 23, Question 89, No. 10 -- if you'd just take a moment 3 to read the introduction. 4 5 THE JUROR: Page 23? 6 THE COURT: Yes, 23, Question 89. MS. CONRAD: Where all the numbers are. 7 THE JUROR: Oh, yes. 8 9 MS. CONRAD: If you take a look at the introduction to 03:59 10 that, it says that 10 reflects a belief that the death penalty 11 should be imposed whenever the defendant has been convicted of 12 intentional murder. So is that how you feel? 13 THE JUROR: No. It shouldn't be in every murder case. 14 MS. CONRAD: Okay. But you selected 10. 15 THE JUROR: I know, because I'm not very good, like I 16 said -- maybe I read through to it too fast. MS. CONRAD: Sure. You said something -- when the 17 18 judge was asking you questions about your opinions about when 19 the death penalty would be appropriate, you said something 04:00 20 about if a police officer is killed. 21 THE JUROR: Right. That wasn't a premeditated. 22 was something that happened in the -- the person that commits 23 the crime is not going to sit back in his cell thinking, oh --24 reliving it, how wonderful it was. 25 MS. CONRAD: But what if it were premeditated?

```
1
                   MR. WEINREB: Objection. That's a precommitment
     2
          question.
     3
                   THE COURT: Yes.
                                     The examples are sort of
          spontaneous. I don't think you can place too much weight on
     4
     5
          them.
     6
                   MS. CONRAD: My question is -- let me ask a different
     7
          question. Do you believe that anyone who commits a
     8
          premeditated murder of a police officer should receive the
          death penalty?
     9
04:00 10
                   MR. WEINREB: Objection.
    11
                   THE COURT: Well, again, I think -- you know, we've
    12
          had this discussion. They're often using terms that have legal
    13
          freight in ways that they may not be clear. It will produce
    14
          ambiguity that is --
    15
                   MS. CONRAD: May I then --
    16
                   MR. WEINREB: Your Honor, I have an additional ground
    17
          as well, which is, offering one aggravating circumstance
    18
          without any of the mitigating circumstances is a case-specific
    19
          Morgan-type question that we've decided long ago is not
04:01 20
          appropriate.
    21
                   THE COURT: I agree with that.
    22
                   MS. CONRAD: Can I ask, ma'am, what you mean by
    23
          premeditated?
    24
                   MR. WEINREB: Objection.
    25
                   THE COURT: No.
```

```
1
                   MS. CONRAD: Do you -- if someone were charged --
          strike that.
     2
                   If someone were found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt
     3
          of a preplanned murder, would you be willing or able to take
     4
     5
          into account facts about the defendant before -- such as his
     6
          background, before deciding whether the death penalty was
     7
          appropriate?
     8
                   THE JUROR: No.
     9
                   MS. CONRAD: Thank you.
04:02 10
                   THE COURT: Is that it?
    11
                   Okay, ma'am. Thank you. You may step out.
    12
                   THE JUROR: Thank you.
                   THE COURT: I think we have time for one more.
    13
    14
                   THE CLERK: Juror No. 452.
    1.5
                   THE JURY CLERK: Juror No. 452.
    16
                   THE CLERK: Sir, over here, please. Have a seat.
    17
                   THE COURT: Good afternoon.
    18
                   THE JUROR: Good afternoon. Hi, Judge.
    19
                   THE COURT: Have you been able to avoid discussing the
04:03 20
          merits of the case with anyone?
    21
                               Absolutely.
                   THE JUROR:
                   THE COURT: And, as much as possible, avoid media
    22
    23
          coverage of the case?
    24
                   THE JUROR: Yes. I don't follow it, you know.
    25
                   THE COURT: That'S the questionnaire that you filled
```

```
1
          out. We're going to follow up on some of the answers you gave
          to get some more information.
     2
                   I'm interested -- this is on Page 4, the beginning.
     3
     4
          You spent a total of four years in Africa?
     5
                   THE JUROR: Yes, I have.
                   THE COURT: Can you tell us about that?
     7
                   THE JUROR: Well, my parents were divorced. My mother
          was a librarian. I was a youth. I was, like, eight and nine
     8
     9
          and then 12 and 13 so two different periods of times for two
04:04 10
          years in two different places.
    11
                   THE COURT: Currently, you're a staff nurse at the
    12
          McLean Hospital.
    13
                   THE JUROR: That's right.
    14
                   THE COURT: You've been doing that for quite awhile?
    1.5
                   THE JUROR: Thirty-eight years in March.
    16
                   THE COURT: Looking at Page 11, we asked about some
          affiliations of you or other family members. You said your
    17
          father was a criminal defense lawyer for about 30 years.
    18
    19
                   THE JUROR: That's right.
04:05 20
                   THE COURT: Where did he practice?
    21
                   THE JUROR: In Florida, in Key West, in Miami,
    22
          Florida, and -- in the south, in Florida primarily.
    23
                   THE COURT: Okay. Now, I think you said your parents
    24
          were divorced. Were you living with him when he was --
    25
                   THE JUROR: No. I was living with my mother.
```

1 visit him. I'd go down for spring breaks or whatever in college and so on, yeah. 2 THE COURT: Your father-in-law was also a -- no. 3 4 was just private practice, not necessarily criminal defense 5 practice, is that it? 6 THE JUROR: Not criminal at all. 7 THE COURT: So let me ask you to turn to Page 20. if it's more convenient, you can take the clip off the page. 8 9 THE JUROR: Okay. 04:06 10 THE COURT: Question 77, in that question we asked 11 whether, based on things you'd seen or read in the media or from other sources, you had formed various opinions. And you 12 13 indicated that, yes, you had formed an opinion the defendant 14 was guilty. And as to the penalty questions, in Part (c) and 15 (d), you said you were unsure. 16 THE JUROR: Right. 17 THE COURT: Then down just below that, we said, If you answered yes to any of the questions, would you be able or 18 19 unable to set aside your opinion and base your decision about 04:06 20 quilt solely on the evidence presented to you in court? And 21 you checked "able." 22 THE JUROR: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Would you tell us about that? 24 THE JUROR: As to the quilty or the penalty phase or 25 which? Just the quilty?

THE COURT: Let's concentrate on the "yes" to guilty and "able" to set aside.

THE JUROR: Okay. So, in general, I have an opinion that the -- Mr. Tsarnaev is guilty. However, I don't know the charges. I don't know the evidence. I don't know anything about it aside from, you know, what was, like, visibly displayed everywhere. I would have to be --

THE COURT: I'm sure you know that in our criminal justice system a person is presumed innocent of any charge against him unless and until the government proves that he's guilty by evidence at the trial and that the government's proof must be convincing enough that the jurors have no reasonable doubt about the fact of the person's guilt. You're familiar with those principles?

THE JUROR: I am.

1.5

04:07 20

04:07 10

THE COURT: What we ask jurors to do is just set aside ideas they might have from other sources about the issues in the case and decide those issues based only on what they hear in the course of the trial. You think you would be able to do that?

THE JUROR: Yeah. I mean, I -- I would go into that, you know, believing that and so I -- that is a fundamental right and so on. I agree with that principle.

THE COURT: If, on any of the particular charges, you thought that the government's proof had not convinced you

1 beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was guilty, would you be able to vote for not quilty? 2 THE JUROR: Absolutely. I mean, sure. 3 THE COURT: In your work, do you have any intersection 4 5 with the criminal justice system? 6 THE JUROR: Not really. I mean, someone may call 911 7 and say, I'm being held here against my will, and the Belmont Police will show up at their door. That is the extent of it. 8 9 Or we might have a forensic consult on a patient, that kind of 04:08 10 thing. In general, no. It's not Bridgewater. It's McLean. 11 THE COURT: Beginning on Page 23, at Question 88, we asked a series of questions about jurors' attitudes regarding 12 13 the death penalty. 88 was a question about views in general, 14 if you had any views about the death penalty in general. And 15 you said, "Generally opposed, possible exceptions." THE JUROR: Right. 16 17 THE COURT: Can you explain that a little? 18 THE JUROR: Sure. I'm generally opposed. You know, 19 probably 30 years ago I would have been for. But then, you 04:09 20 know, the DNA evidence and the questions that have come up 21 about it, I've become more generally opposed. Possible 22 exceptions would be, you know, war crimes, the Nuremberg Trial 23 or terrorism, I think, and serial killers. There are some 24 things that probably I would lean more towards being in favor 25 of it.

1 THE COURT: So in 89 we asked you to place yourself on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is strongly opposed and would never 2 vote to impose; 10 being the opposite of that, strongly in 3 favor and virtually always would vote to. You placed yourself 4 5 as No. 2. Anything you want to say about that? 6 THE JUROR: Well, I just probably, you know, statistically thinking that the vast majority of crimes don't 7 fall into those exceptions of mine; and so, therefore, I would 8 9 be more towards the strongly opposed than not. 04:10 10 THE COURT: On the next page, in Question 90, we asked 11 it not with numbers but with words and asked if you found a statement among the several you had to choose from that 12 13 expressed your view the best. You chose (c). "I'm opposed to 14 the death penalty, but I could vote to impose it if I believed 15 that the facts and the law in the particular case called for 16 it." Is that a --THE JUROR: Right. I think that's accurate. 17 haven't had time to look over these others. 18 19 THE COURT: Take your time. 04:10 20 THE JUROR: Okay, sure, absolutely. 21 Okay. So (c) or (d). I'd have to look and break 22 those down. "I'm not for or against the death penalty." "I'm 23 more against it." "I could vote to impose it or I could vote 24 to impose a sentence" -- either (c) or (d). They seem to be

25

pretty close.

1 THE COURT: Well, one of the differences between (c) and (d) is (c) begins by saying you're opposed to the death 2 penalty. The other says you're neither for or against. 3 4 THE JUROR: Right. Then I am not for or against, 5 although, as I've said, you know, in 90 percent or more, I'm 6 more against but I'm not -- to me, being against something 7 means more like (a) so --THE COURT: You read for or against "always," one way 8 9 or the other; is that what you're saying? 04:12 10 THE JUROR: Right. 11 THE COURT: Because you're not an always, in your 12 view, in either direction, you're somewhere in the middle? 13 THE JUROR: Yeah, exactly, more towards --14 THE COURT: Let's look at the bottom of Page 25, 15 Question 95. And that question puts it in the context of this 16 case. If you found Mr. Tsarnaev guilty and you decided that the death penalty was the appropriate punishment for him, could 17 you conscientiously vote for the death penalty? And you 18 19 checked "yes." 04:12 20 THE JUROR: Yeah. So it's presumed that I found him 21 quilty and decided that it was the appropriate punishment. If 22 I did that, I would not for some other reason say no, you know, 23 so, I mean, if I reached those conclusions. 24 THE COURT: Right. And then at the top of the next 25 page, 96, we asked the parallel question. If you found him

```
1
          quilty and decided that life imprisonment without the
          possibility of release was the appropriate punishment, could
     2
          you conscientiously vote for life imprisonment without the
     3
          possibility of release? And you checked "yes" there.
     4
     5
                   THE JUROR: Right. So, yeah, I think it's kind of the
     6
          same thing in a way. It doesn't really have the death penalty
          involved in this question, so I would be --
     7
                   THE COURT: This is the alternate.
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: Yeah. If I thought that it was life
04:13 10
          imprisonment and that was the appropriate, then I would
    11
          absolutely certify that if that's what I thought.
    12
                   THE COURT: Okay. All right. Follow-up?
    13
                   MR. WEINREB: Thank you, your Honor. Good afternoon.
    14
                   THE JUROR: Hi.
    15
                   MR. WEINREB: My name is Bill Weinreb. I'm one of the
    16
          prosecutors in the case.
    17
                   THE JUROR: Okay.
    18
                   MR. WEINREB: I just want to follow up on one thing,
    19
          which is the nature of your work at McLean.
04:13 20
                   THE JUROR: Sure.
    21
                   MR. WEINREB: What kind of care do you provide to the
    22
          patients?
    23
                   THE JUROR: The very best.
    24
           (Laughter.)
    25
                   MR. WEINREB: That's really all I needed to know.
```

04:14 20

04:14 10

THE JUROR: So it's a 28-bed psychotic disorders unit.

Schizophrenia and bipolar are the main diagnoses. So it's fairly short term. When I started at McLean, the average stay was 381 days. Now it's down to about 12. So it's just direct clinical care of the patient. I'm a member of the rounds teams. I administer medications. I speak with the patients individually and so on.

MR. WEINREB: Do you -- I assume you don't do diagnostic tests?

THE JUROR: I don't, no. I'm a nurse.

MR. WEINREB: Do you do therapy with them though of any kind?

THE JUROR: No, just what we call staff talks, just sort of checking in with the person, just trying to reassure them or help them along in the process.

MR. WEINREB: Are you part of discussions with the doctors and the staff about what the problems are?

THE JUROR: Absolutely. It's a very democratic place. I don't know if you know anything about McLean. That's one of the best things I've felt about it in all my time there. So, absolutely. Nurses and mental health workers and everybody has a lot of input into what's going on. I may know something that the doctor hasn't come across and/or -- you know, I'm not going to say, I think this person is bipolar. I'm not going to go over those boundaries, but I'm going to give information and

```
1
          communicate, you know, what I've observed and assessed.
                   MR. WEINREB: Okay. Thanks very much.
     2
                   THE COURT: Sure, absolutely.
     3
                   MS. CONRAD: Good afternoon, sir. My name is Miriam
     4
     5
          Conrad. I'm one of Mr. Tsarnaev's lawyers.
     6
                   THE JUROR: Hi.
                   MS. CONRAD: You mentioned that there were certain
     7
          exceptions where you thought the death penalty was appropriate,
     8
          and you mentioned a few of those. In those exceptions, would
     9
04:15 10
          you automatically vote for the death penalty?
    11
                   MR. WEINREB: Objection. That's not --
                   THE COURT: No. Go ahead. You can answer that.
    12
                   THE JUROR: I don't -- no. I don't have a checklist
    13
    14
          necessarily. You know what I mean? I think each case is
          individual. So I wouldn't say, Okay, you know, Goring should
    1.5
    16
          be killed but Hitler should be left off. I don't know. I
          don't have a hard-and-fast rule about --
    17
                   MS. CONRAD: You would be able to listen to the
    18
    19
          evidence during the penalty phase and consider both facts about
04:16 20
          the crime and facts about the defendant himself before deciding
    21
          what the appropriate punishment is?
    22
                   THE JUROR: Oh, absolutely.
    23
                   MS. CONRAD: Thank you.
    24
                   THE COURT: Okay, sir. Thank you very much.
    25
                   THE JUROR: Thank you.
```

```
THE COURT: We'll take a lunch break. 2:00.
     1
           (Luncheon recess taken at 1:03 p.m.)
     2
                    (The Court enters the courtroom at 2:08 p.m.)
     3
                   THE COURT: Okay. Ready?
     4
     5
                   THE CLERK: Juror No. 453.
                   THE JURY CLERK: Juror No. 453.
                    (The juror enters the courtroom.)
                   THE CLERK: Sir, over here, if you would. Take a
     8
     9
          seat.
05:21 10
                   Keep your voice up and speak into the mic, okay?
    11
                   THE JUROR: Okay.
    12
                   THE COURT: Good afternoon.
    13
                   THE JUROR: Good afternoon.
    14
                   THE COURT: Have you been able to avoid discussion of
    1.5
          the merits of the case since we were last here?
    16
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    17
                   THE COURT: And also as much as possible avoid media
    18
          accounts?
    19
                   THE JUROR: I haven't talked to anyone.
05:21 20
                   THE COURT: But I'm talking about the media too.
    21
                   THE JUROR: Yeah, the media too. Definitely not the
    22
          media.
    23
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
    24
                    So I'm going to follow up on some of the answers you
    25
          gave to some of the questions.
```

```
1
                   THE JUROR:
                               Okay.
                   THE COURT: You're currently an assistant professor in
     2
          political science?
     3
                   THE JUROR: Yup.
     4
     5
                   THE COURT: Any special concentration?
                   THE JUROR: Political science. Oh, I'm sorry.
     6
          Comparative politics. I do immigration politics, Latin
     7
     8
          America, development, international relations. Is that what
     9
          you meant?
05:22 10
                   THE COURT: Yeah.
    11
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
    12
                   THE COURT: Yeah. Both undergraduate and graduate?
    13
                   THE JUROR: Well, UMass -- oh, I'm not supposed to
    14
          say.
    15
                   THE COURT: You can.
                                         That's all right.
    16
                   THE JUROR: Well, the school I teach at there's mostly
    17
          undergrads. So I have taught some graduate courses but -- in
    18
          development, but most of the time I teach undergrads.
    19
                   THE COURT: Okay. You're working on a book?
05:22 20
                   THE JUROR: I just finished it, actually.
    21
                   THE COURT: Oh, you did. What is the topic? Just
    22
          generally.
    23
                   THE JUROR: Remittances. Remittances. Money that
    24
          migrants send back to their home countries.
    25
                   THE COURT: Okay. You write on a blog at the
```

```
1
          University of Pittsburgh?
                   THE JUROR: Yeah. It's, you know, sort of a political
     2
          scientist talking about current events. It's all about Latin
     3
     4
          America, though. Nothing about the U.S. Well, that's not
     5
          true. I have written about U.S.-related issues with the war on
     6
          drugs and that sort of thing, but nothing domestic.
     7
                   THE COURT: And in terms of Facebook and Twitter, you
          use them --
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: I do use Facebook very often, yes.
05:23 10
                   THE COURT: For --
    11
                   THE JUROR: Twit- --
    12
                   THE COURT: -- personal matters?
    13
                   THE JUROR: Personal matters, yes. I don't have any
    14
          page -- I do express political opinions from time to time, but
          it's personal. And Twitter, I actually just joined recently,
    15
    16
          but I haven't -- I tweeted one thing, so that's it.
                   THE COURT: Okay. I see -- this is on page 11 at
    17
    18
          Question 31 -- that you had a cousin who was killed in Iraq in
    19
          2006?
05:24 20
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    21
                   THE COURT: Can you tell us about that?
    22
                   THE JUROR: Yeah. My cousin, he was a medic. We were
    23
          fairly close, actually. Sorry. And he -- he joined Iraq
    24
          and -- actually, I feel very strongly about it because I didn't
    25
          agree with the war in the first place. I thought that it was a
```

```
1
          mistake that he joined the Army. He did it because he wanted
          to go to college and couldn't pay for it. And he thought,
     2
          "I'll join the military." The kid -- yeah. Wasted life, you
     3
     4
          know.
     5
                   Anyway, yeah. Sorry.
     6
                   THE COURT: Yeah, I understand. So similar to you in
     7
          age? Were you growing up together or --
                   THE JUROR: Oh, in age? He was a little younger than
     8
     9
          me, about three years younger than me.
05:24 10
                   THE COURT: Yeah.
    11
                   THE JUROR: Also an immigrant who had come here soon
    12
          after -- yeah, soon after. Soon after I came.
                   THE COURT: Yeah.
    13
    14
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
    15
                   THE COURT: Did you grow up in the same area?
    16
                   THE JUROR: No, no. Well, I mean, up until -- I came
          here when I was 12, and before that we grew up together in the
    17
          same city. Then I came to Arizona and he went to California,
    18
    19
          and we saw each other a few times. And, yeah, it -- we were
          planning to go to a game before he went in the -- yeah.
05:25 20
    21
                   THE COURT: Yeah, I can see it affects you.
    22
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
    23
                   THE COURT: Do you know the circumstances of --
    24
                   THE JUROR: He was in a Humvee in Iraq. They were
    25
          driving. I don't know where they were going or what they were
```

```
1
          doing. But he was in a Humvee and there was an -- what do you
          call it, an explosive on the side of the road. Some, you
     2
          know -- I don't know, the rebels or whatever put something on
     3
          the side and then -- yeah. Okay.
     4
     5
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
                                      Yeah.
     6
                   THE COURT: We asked various questions about
     7
          organizations or causes that you might have been affiliated
          with or supported. On Question 39 on page 13 --
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
05:26 10
                   THE COURT: -- you noted two, I guess.
    11
                   One was immigration law reform as you've already
    12
          adverted to, and also death penalty laws reform. Can you tell
    13
          us a little bit about that?
    14
                   THE JUROR: Yeah. So both? In the case of --
    15
                   THE COURT: Yeah, okay. Both. Sure.
                                                          I was more
    16
          interested in the death penalty --
    17
                   THE JUROR: Yeah, obviously, I would think.
    18
                   Immigration law, I just went on a rally in D.C. about
    19
          support for comprehensive immigration reform. Death penalty
05:26 20
          law reform I was at a meeting where people were talking about
    21
          reforming the death penalty. My wife works for a foundation
    22
          that supports abolishing the death penalty, and so those were
    23
          the people that I --
    24
                   THE COURT: Do you know the name of the foundation?
                   THE JUROR: Proteus, P-R-O-T-E-U-S.
    25
```

```
1
                   THE COURT: Okay. In Question 72, this is now on page
          19, we asked if you'd called a talk show, written a letter to
     2
          an editor, posted a comment and so on about issues, and you
     3
          said, "Yes. Immigration, Latin American politics and U.S.
     4
     5
          invasion of Iraq."
     6
                   THE JUROR: Expanding: Invasion of Iraq, I was asked
     7
          to talk about it with a Hawaiian on TV. They were asking me
          about veterans -- what was happening was we were leaving Iraq,
     8
     9
          or Obama said that the war was over, we're bringing troops
05:28 10
          back, and they asked me to comment on it, so I did.
    11
                   THE COURT: Who asked?
    12
                   THE JUROR: It was a Hawaiian talk show. So, you
    13
          know, like a politics sort of general show. And, yeah. That's
    14
          what you --
    1.5
                   THE COURT: When was that?
    16
                   THE JUROR: When did Obama -- whenever that was.
          2010, 20- -- yeah, 2010.
    17
                   THE COURT: On page 20 --
    18
    19
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
05:28 20
                   THE COURT: -- if you'd look at Question 77.
    21
                   THE JUROR: Yup.
    22
                   THE COURT: In this question we've asked whether,
    23
          based on things you'd seen or heard, you'd formed an opinion
    24
          that the defendant was guilty and if you had an opinion about
    25
          the penalty that should be imposed and so on.
```

1 THE JUROR: Yeah.

05:29 20

05:29 10

THE COURT: You answered yes, you had an opinion that he was guilty, and as to the penalty you were unsure.

THE JUROR: Yeah.

THE COURT: Then we asked below that, "If you answered yes to any of these questions, would you be able or unable to set aside your opinion and base your decision about guilt solely on the evidence that will be presented to you in court," and you said, "I do not know."

Can you tell us about that?

THE JUROR: Well, I don't think -- I feel pretty strongly about the death penalty, but in the case -- in this particular case.

THE COURT: Before we get to the death penalty, I want to focus on Part A where you said you had an opinion that he was guilty.

THE JUROR: So prior to this case -- I'm not originally from Boston. I didn't know anything about really the Boston Marathon. And so when it happened, it was pretty shocking, the whole thing. So I read extensively about it. I mean, I teach politics, so of course I was interested in the particular case. I read about lots of articles on Slate. I read them on Boston Globe and a bunch of other places.

And so at least from what I read, it seemed pretty clear that he was guilty, guilty in the sense that he had been

1 part of this and he had committed -- you know, that he had been part of the killing of the MIT officer, that he had been 2 setting the bombs in the Boston Marathon. Yeah, so to me that 3 4 seems pretty clear that he's guilty. 5 And then what do you want me to say, or what did you 6 want me to answer? So should he receive the death penalty? 7 THE COURT: No. No, not yet. THE JUROR: Sorry, sorry, sorry. 8 9 THE COURT: In our criminal justice system a person 05:30 10 who is accused of a crime is presumed to be innocent, or not 11 guilty --12 THE JUROR: Right. 13 THE COURT: -- unless the government proves that he's 14 quilty by the evidence at trial. And we ask trial jurors to 15 evaluate the evidence and tell us whether the government has 16 proved that or not. 17 THE JUROR: Right. THE COURT: And if they're satisfied beyond a 18 19 reasonable doubt that the government has proved the fact of 05:30 20 quilt, then they may return a verdict of quilty, but if they're 21 not convinced of that, it's the obligation of the jury to find 22 the person not guilty. 23 THE JUROR: Right. 24 THE COURT: It's understandable that people have 25 impressions about what happened in this case and that they

1 would approach the jury service having that in some degree. And the question -- the second part of the question asked would 2 you be -- to the extent you had such opinions, would you be 3 able to set them aside and to concentrate on the trial evidence 4 5 and make a judgment based on that body of evidence alone 6 regardless of what other impressions you had from those reports or otherwise? 7 THE JUROR: Right. 8 9 THE COURT: So that's really the self-assessment 05:31 10 question. Do you think you would be able to do that? 11 THE JUROR: I think it would be very difficult to. can't say for sure that I wouldn't, but I think it would be 12 13 very, very difficult for me to get rid of impressions I have. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Let's now turn for a minute to the 15 death penalty questions. 16 THE JUROR: Okay. 17 THE COURT: And that's on 23. 18 THE JUROR: Yeah. 19 THE COURT: Beginning at Question 88. 05:32 20 THE JUROR: Yup. 21 88 is a question whether you had views THE COURT: 22 about the death penalty in general, what are they. And you 23 wrote, "I believe the death penalty should be abolished. As 24 much as I believe Tsarnaev is quilty, I do not think he should be executed." 25

1 THE JUROR: That's correct.

05:33 20

05:32 10

THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to amplify on that at all or...

THE JUROR: So I believe very strongly -- or fairly strongly -- that the death penalty should not be -- should not exist here or anywhere. Although I think -- and the reason why I think that's the case is because it's very difficult, I think, to have an impartial reading of cases. In this particular case it might be clear, say. There are cases -- there are many cases that have been -- death penalty has been imparted. In Texas, for instance, in Florida, in Alabama, which I think the -- okay. My impression is that it was wrong, and people have written about this. And so because I think there's always a possibility that it could be wrong, I think that the death penalty should be abolished because there's always a possibility that people are innocent and that they get killed. So that's what I think generally about the death penalty.

In Mexico, which is where I was from, does not have the death penalty, and so maybe that's where I get this from. But -- so, yeah. So I think generally as it is, it should be abolished, and if I had the power to do that, I would do it today.

Nonetheless, even though I believe that the death penalty should be abolished, there are cases I think, for

instance, in the case of the Aurora shooter or the Newtown situation, where the crimes are so horrendous that I can understand why the death penalty exists, let's say, people feel whatever.

And so I don't think personally I would be able to execute -- or to decide for the execution of anyone. And even though I think -- my impression is that Tsarnaev is guilty, I don't think that I would be able to say that he should be executed.

THE COURT: Okay. And I just want to, I guess -- you indicated that generally by the next question --

THE JUROR: The 2?

05:35 20

05:34 10

THE COURT: -- the 2, and then again on the next page,

Question 90, where you chose as close to your views Statement

B, which is you're opposed to the death penalty, would have a

difficult time voting to impose it?

THE JUROR: Yeah. So the reason I put a 2, for instance, is because I can imagine a possibility where, I suppose -- like Hitler, for instance, or somebody like that -- where they commit genocide or something so horrendous that I suppose I could have -- I would vote in that instance. But in this case I don't think -- I don't think the -- at least -- and I don't know in the previous question -- I don't foresee myself as being able to do that, but I suppose there's a possibility that I could be okay. I don't know.

```
But I think even if the facts -- even if the facts
     1
          were clear -- as I said before, even if he was quilty, it would
     2
          be very difficult for me to say we should execute him.
     3
                   THE COURT: Okay. Finally, for me, anyway -- and the
     4
     5
          lawyers will have a chance to ask you things if they want -- on
     6
          page 26.
     7
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
                   THE COURT: The Question 97.
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
05:35 10
                   THE COURT: You say, "I teach international relations,
    11
          so I'm familiar with Tsarnaev's claims about Russian and
          American terrorism."
    12
    13
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
    14
                   THE COURT: What are those claims?
    15
                   THE JUROR: Well, claims about Putin in particular;
    16
          about the oppression from the Russian state on Chechnya and on
          the neighboring states; claims about abuses and people getting
    17
          killed; police brutality, et cetera. And I'm also familiar
    18
    19
          with -- or claims about the United States being unfair to
05:36 20
          Muslims, about the invasion of Iraq and all of these things
    21
          related to the Muslim world. I don't necessarily agree, but I
    22
          am familiar.
    23
                   THE COURT: I understand.
    24
                   You put it in terms of "the defendant's claims." How
    25
          do you know what the defendant's claims are?
```

1 THE JUROR: Well, from the reading -- from what I was -- from what I had read prior to the -- my impressions, 2 anyway, of --3 4 THE COURT: From the sources you were talking about? 5 THE JUROR: Yes, from Slate, from the Boston Globe, 6 from magazines, et cetera, yeah. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Questions? MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Yes. Good afternoon. My name is 8 9 Aloke Chakravarty. I'm one of the prosecutors in the case. 05:37 10 THE JUROR: Yeah. 11 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Some follow-up questions. Let me just start with that last issue that the judge raised about 12 13 what you may have read about the defendant's claims. 14 Do you mean statements the defendant made? 15 THE JUROR: No. I don't -- I don't -- to be honest, 16 this was a year ago, right? So it was April of 2013. So, you know, there was a lot of attention about it. And I read, for 17 instance -- I think it was on Slate. I don't remember all the 18 19 sources. But I remember reading about his family and how they 05:37 20 had lived in different parts of Russia and they had come to the 21 United States and what their life was like and some of the -- the older brother's -- I do remember the older brother's 22 23 claims about hatred against Muslims and how the United States 24 had been oppressive and that sort of thing. I don't remember 25 his particular claims, if he -- I mean, reading whether he

1 specifically made these claims or not. But that's my impression, that he at least supported them to some extent. 2 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: So this period that you were 3 4 actively learning about this case. 5 THE JUROR: Yeah? 6 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: What time period would you say that 7 you were doing that? THE JUROR: Right after the marathon -- the stories 8 9 that came out, there was a lot of interest on, you know, what 05:38 10 could have possibly led people to do this, how did it 11 come -- and I was interested also because they're immigrants and they're white -- or at least perceived as white. And 12 13 so -- because I teach immigrant politics, there's a lot of talk 14 about, you know, Mexicans being criminals and the criminalization of immigrants, so I was very interested in how 1.5 16 the media would portray these people. And so I was interested in that, and that's why -- so 17 I don't remember the exact timeline, but the months after 18 19 whatever was written I probably read it, between May 2013 and, I don't know, August 2013, roughly, those months that came 05:39 20 2.1 after? 22 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: And so your courses that you teach 23 are in immigrant policies? 24 THE JUROR: Immigration politics. 25 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Politics? Excuse me.

1 THE JUROR: Which is -- right now I'm teaching it, actually. And it's about what states do in response to 2 immigrants coming. So I go through all of the different 3 countries, the United States -- not all of the different 4 5 countries, but the main countries -- in Europe, France, Spain, 6 England, Sweden, Italy, so on. I don't do Russia. Maybe I 7 should. Japan, Korea and so on. But I also -- and in my other 8 class, international relations, I talk about migrant flows and 9 things like that. 05:39 10 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: And do you talk about the asylum 11 process in your --12 THE JUROR: I do talk about the asylum process, yeah. 13 That is not a main focus of it, but I do talk about it. Mostly 14 Cubans, though. 1.5 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: I don't think we asked you what your 16 course schedule is like this semester. 17 THE JUROR: I'm teaching two classes. Immigration 18 politics is one; the other is Latin America politics, Tuesday 19 and Thursday. 05:40 20 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: What time? 21 THE JUROR: 9:30 to 10:45 and 12:30 to 1:45. 22 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Okay. And so if you're seated on 23 this case, those times would have to change. Is that something that --24 25 THE JUROR: Well, actually, I don't know that they

```
1
          would -- I couldn't teach them. Somebody would have
          to -- actually, I have no idea what that would mean.
     2
          Obviously, right, I couldn't teach.
     3
     4
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: That's a question for you.
     5
                   THE JUROR: I don't know. I don't know the answer to
     6
          that. Presumably the school would have to get somebody or they
          would have to cancel the classes.
     7
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Okay. You're an assistant
     8
     9
          professor? I'm just trying to get a sense of your tenure
05:40 10
          track.
    11
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: How does that --
    12
    13
                   THE JUROR: Well, I submitted the book, so hopefully
    14
          they'll publish it, and I should hear within two months. And I
    15
          have a few articles and -- a few articles that are out, so
    16
          hopefully -- you know, I'm moving along.
    17
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: So the classes issue should not
    18
          hamper your career?
    19
                   THE JUROR: No, the class issue should not -- no, it's
05:41 20
          the research.
    21
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: So the question on the class issue
    22
          is: Is it a hardship either to you or, you know, in the
    23
          interest of your students if you --
    24
                   THE JUROR: Yeah, I don't know the answer to that. It
    25
          would be a hardship, but I have no idea what the school would
```

do. Like, can they teach -- can somebody teach immigration politics? I don't know. I don't know if they can get somebody. So presumably they would have to cancel the class, in which case that wouldn't be a hardship for me; it would be a hardship for 80 students: 40 students on immigration politics and 40 students on Latin America politics.

MR. CHAKRAVARTY: And you already started teaching?

THE JUROR: Yeah. We're a little bit behind, just like you are, with the snow. Just a little bit. But, yeah.

MR. CHAKRAVARTY: One more point on your study. This book that you wrote, remittances.

THE JUROR: Yeah?

05:42 20

05:41 10

MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Do you write about terrorism financing?

MR. CHAKRAVARTY: That was my thesis in undergrad, so

```
1
          I commend you for writing something scholarly.
                   THE JUROR: Very good.
     2
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: All right. So I want to ask you a
     3
          little bit about your wife's work.
     4
     5
                   THE JUROR: Yup.
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: The Proteus Foundation, is it?
     7
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: The death penalty is one of their
     8
     9
          causes.
05:43 10
                   You indicated that you've spoken about the death
    11
          penalty with her. Ostensibly you've even --
    12
                   THE JUROR: I attend it, yeah.
    13
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Yeah. So would you be able to
    14
          consider -- just at the threshold stage are you -- would you be
    15
          able to hold aside any of her convictions and your discussions
    16
          with her, anything she may have said to you and what her
          response might be based on your actions in this case, would
    17
          that not -- could you shield that from your decision-making?
    18
    19
                   THE JUROR: I could -- yes, I could hold my -- like
05:43 20
          talking about it or, you know, my conversations with her,
    21
          whatever, but it would be hard to -- my own convictions about
    22
          it because, like I said, if I could, I would abolish the death
    23
          penalty today, right now.
    24
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: And that's your independent --
    25
                   THE JUROR: That's mine, yeah. That's mine.
```

1 She -- actually, I don't know if she feels stronger than me or not. I think she's probably exactly where I am. 2 But, yeah, I could -- that's a good question. I don't know. 3 4 I'll have to find out at some point. But -- yeah. Anyway... 5 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: And so it's fair to say you grew up 6 generally opposing the death penalty based on just --7 THE JUROR: Yeah. MR. CHAKRAVARTY: I mean, you said you lived in 8 Mexico. 9 05:44 10 THE JUROR: Yeah. 11 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: But had you actually contemplated 12 the death penalty and your position on it when you were there? 13 THE JUROR: I was 12 when I came to the United States, 14 so, no, I probably didn't think about the death penalty very 15 often. And I indicated that I guess my position has softened 16 over the years because, I don't know, you get older and wiser, I suppose. I don't know. But, you know, there are cases I 17 18 suppose that could happen. But, yeah, I don't know -- I don't 19 think I -- I don't think I thought about it very carefully 05:44 20 before I came to the United States, but the change in coming 21 from Mexico to the U.S. I think had something to do with my 22 idea about it, if that makes any sense. 23 MR. CHAKRAVARTY: I think so. You just finished 24 talking about the death penalty, and there are a couple of 25 other points I wanted to make.

```
1
                   If you'd look at the questionnaire.
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
     2
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: I think you've been very clear in
     3
     4
          terms of where you are on the death penalty.
     5
                   THE JUROR: Yup.
     6
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Question 95 asks whether you can
     7
          impose it and --
                   THE JUROR: For the what?
     8
     9
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: I'm sorry. Page 25, Question 95.
05:45 10
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
    11
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Reading that anew, is that still
    12
          your answer?
    13
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
    14
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Okay. So it's in the middle; it's
    15
          not a "no"?
    16
                   THE JUROR: I don't know. I mean -- I don't know.
    17
          mean, the more I think about it, the more -- I don't know.
          thing is, I think he's quilty. And so I suppose I could say
    18
    19
          yes, but I feel very strongly about the death penalty. So it
05:46 20
          would be a real dilemma for me. It would be a real moral
    21
          dilemma. So, I don't know. If I had to say if I was leaning
    22
          toward one or the other, I would say no.
    23
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: So what this question's trying to
    24
          capture is a distinction between the cognitive decision of
    25
          whether it actually applies versus whether you could impose it,
```

```
1
          but --
                   THE JUROR: Oh, I see what you're saying. So you're
     2
     3
          asking --
     4
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Hold on one moment while I just
     5
          think about it.
     6
                   Your Honor, I think we've heard -- we're satisfied
          that we've gotten the information, so instead of asking these
     7
     8
          questions, I'll just withdraw it.
     9
                   THE COURT: All right.
05:46 10
                   MR. CHAKRAVARTY: Thank you very much.
    11
                   THE JUROR: Okay.
    12
                   THE COURT: That's it. Thank you.
    13
                   THE JUROR: Thank you.
    14
                   THE COURT: Just leave that.
    15
                   THE CLERK: Just leave that. Thanks a lot.
    16
                   THE JUROR: Good luck.
    17
                   (The juror exits the courtroom.)
    18
                   THE CLERK: Juror No. 454.
    19
                   THE JURY CLERK: Juror No. 454.
05:47 20
                   (The juror enters the courtroom.)
    21
                   THE CLERK: Sir, over here, if you would. Have a
    22
          seat. Keep your voice up and speak into the mic.
    23
                   THE JUROR: Okay.
                   THE COURT: Good afternoon.
    24
    25
                   THE JUROR: Good afternoon, your Honor.
```

```
1
                   THE COURT: Have you been able to avoid talking about
          the case or viewing media accounts about the case?
     2
     3
                   THE JUROR: I have.
                   THE COURT: Yeah? So we're going to follow up on some
     4
     5
          of the answers you gave us in the questionnaire when you filled
          it out.
     6
     7
                   THE JUROR: Okay.
                   THE COURT: And it's there for you if you want to
     8
     9
          follow along with us.
05:48 10
                   So you tell us in the questionnaire -- we had a
    11
          question about employment, and you said you're disabled?
    12
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    13
                   THE COURT: Can you tell us the nature of the
    14
          disability?
    15
                   THE JUROR: I have a back problem.
    16
                   THE COURT: A back problem?
    17
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    18
                   THE COURT: Is it something that you regularly take
    19
          medication for?
05:48 20
                   THE JUROR: I don't anymore. I just had surgery
    21
          recently and had it corrected.
    22
                   THE COURT: So is it corrected so that you can stop
    23
          being disabled or --
    24
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    25
                   THE COURT: -- just to ameliorate it?
```

```
1
                   THE JUROR: No, it's eliminated.
                   THE COURT: Are you expecting to go back to work?
     2
     3
                   THE JUROR: I am starting to look for work now, yes.
                   THE COURT: Okay. And I think you were in the
     4
     5
          construction business somehow?
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
     7
                   THE COURT: Can you tell us what you did before the
          disability? What kind of work did you do?
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: Well, I started doing security work
05:49 10
          because of the back problem.
    11
                   THE COURT: Right. That's fine. Tell us about that.
    12
                   THE JUROR: I did that for a few years.
    13
                   THE COURT: When was the last time you were able to
    14
          work at any job? Approximately.
    15
                   THE JUROR: It goes back many, many years.
    16
                   THE COURT: Okay. And the only reason I asked about
          construction was I see you went to Wentworth.
    17
    18
                   THE JUROR: I did.
    19
                   THE COURT: And did you enter that field at all?
05:49 20
                   THE JUROR: I didn't graduate. I was there for a year
    21
          and a half, I believe.
    22
                   THE COURT: Oh, I see. All right. So the last time
    23
          you were employed you were in the security field?
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    24
    25
                   THE COURT: That's, what, building security? Is that
```

```
what you mean? What kind of things were you doing?
     1
                   THE JUROR: No, security in a building, protecting the
     2
          building and the property.
     3
                   THE COURT: Right. Were you working for a
     4
     5
          security company or did you work for a particular manufacturing
          or institution or anything else like that and were on their own
     6
          security force?
     7
                   THE JUROR: A business. Filene's Basement.
     8
     9
                   THE COURT: Okay. So I think we started to ask about
05:51 10
          it. You're beginning to think about going back to work? Have
    11
          you started actively looking for a job?
                   THE JUROR: I haven't yet, but I fully intend to.
    12
    13
                   THE COURT: Okay. You know, I quess from what we told
    14
          you in the form, if you were to be a juror on this case it
    15
          could be several months.
    16
                   THE JUROR: Uh-huh.
    17
                   THE COURT: That would probably interfere with your
    18
          ability to find work. Would that be a problem for you?
    19
                   THE JUROR: It would interfere, yes, but I'm prepared
          to serve if I need to.
05:51 20
    21
                   THE COURT: Yeah? In a sense -- it would interfere in
    22
          the sense that it might postpone the time when you might go
    23
          back to work?
    24
                   THE JUROR: Right.
    25
                   THE COURT: Any other way?
```

No.

THE JUROR:

1

```
THE COURT: So I guess the guestion is:
     2
     3
          unreasonable to ask you to postpone going back to work on our
     4
          part?
     5
                   THE JUROR: I've been ready to serve if need be.
     6
                   THE COURT: All right. As long as you have thought
     7
          about it.
                   Let me ask you to go to page 20, Question 77. In this
     8
     9
          question we asked whether, based on things you'd seen or read
05:52 10
          in the media, you had learned -- or you had learned from other
    11
          sources, had you formed an opinion that the defendant was
    12
          guilty, and you checked "yes," Part A of the question. Do you
    13
          see that?
    14
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    15
                   THE COURT: And the second half, C and D, is whether
    16
          he should receive the death penalty or not, and you said "yes"
          to Part C, right?
    17
    18
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    19
                   THE COURT: Just below that, then, we asked, "If you
05:53 20
          answered yes to any of these questions, would you be able or
    21
          unable to set aside your present opinion and base your decision
    22
          about guilt and punishment solely based on the evidence that
    23
          would be presented to you in court?" And you checked "able" --
    24
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    25
                   THE COURT: -- saying you'd be able to do that.
```

1 Can you tell us about that? THE JUROR: I feel I would -- listen to the evidence 2 and decide after that. 3 4 THE COURT: I presume you know that in a criminal 5 prosecution the person who's accused of a crime is presumed to 6 be innocent, or not guilty, unless the government proves him 7 quilty beyond a reasonable doubt by the evidence at trial. Are you familiar with those principles? 8 9 THE JUROR: Yes. 05:54 10 THE COURT: So what we ask jurors to do, even if they 11 have some ideas from other sources, to make their judgment in the case based on what they have heard in the courtroom or seen 12 in the courtroom and not on matters from elsewhere. 13 14 THE JUROR: Uh-huh. 1.5 THE COURT: Would you be able to assess the evidence 16 alone and put aside any ideas you may have from other sources in thinking about whether the government has proved the 17 defendant quilty of any charge or not? 18 19 THE JUROR: I feel I would be able to. 05:54 20 THE COURT: We asked a series of questions about the 21 death penalty and attitudes toward it beginning on page 23, 22 Question 88. 88 asked if you had any views about the death 23 penalty in general, and you said, "I do favor the death 24 penalty." 25 THE JUROR: Yes.

1 THE COURT: Anything you want to add to that? THE JUROR: If it's appropriate, I believe in the 2 3 death penalty. THE COURT: Okay. In the next question we asked you 4 5 to circle a number that indicated where you were on the scale from 1 to 10 where 1 was strongly opposed and 10 was strongly in favor, but if you look at the question, it was defined as --7 10 reflects a belief that the death penalty should be imposed 8 whenever the defendant has been convicted of an intentional 9 05:55 10 murder. 11 THE JUROR: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Let's go to the next question, Question 13 90. And this asks you if there was a statement that you agreed 14 with to indicate that. You selected E which says, "I am in favor of the death penalty, but I could vote for a sentence of 15 16 life imprisonment without the possibility of release if I 17 believed that sentence was called for by the facts and the 18 law." 19 Does that represent your view? 05:56 20 THE JUROR: It does, yes. 21 THE COURT: Well, that's a little bit different from 22 circling 10, because 10 was whenever someone was convicted of 23 murder, and this seems to be that you'd decide based on the

facts and the law of the case. Or maybe you don't think it's

24

25

inconsistent.

1 THE JUROR: Can I reread this? 2 THE COURT: Yeah, go ahead. Take your time. 3 (Pause.) THE COURT: And if you want, take a minute or two to 4 5 read all of Question 90 and see if there might be some 6 different statement you might choose as representing your views. Take a moment. 7 (Pause.) 8 THE JUROR: I'm still confused. 9 05:57 10 THE COURT: Well, forget the questions. Tell us 11 whether you would be in favor of the death penalty anytime someone was convicted of a -- let me back up for a minute. 12 13 You understand that you're considering the question of 14 what the penalty should be, death penalty/life imprisonment, only if the jury has convicted somebody of a capital crime such 15 16 as intentional murder. 17 THE JUROR: Uh-huh. 18 THE COURT: So first you've already -- the jury's 19 already agreed that the person is guilty, okay? So the 05:58 20 question is what sentence is appropriate for this quilty 21 person, right? And then the question is -- you heard me this 22 morning talk about the so-called penalty phase where the 23 government would try to produce evidence to convince the jury 24 that there were certain aggravating factors about the case that

made it worse than other crimes of murder and the defense would

25

1 try to present evidence of things about the defendant or about the circumstances that would suggest that the death penalty was 2 not the right penalty but life imprisonment was a better 3 4 choice. 5 Do you remember me describing that this morning? 6 THE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: So the question is: If you were a juror 7 considering all that, would you tend, in a case where there was 8 9 an intentional murder, to think that the death penalty is the 05:59 10 right punishment regardless of other considerations, or would 11 you evaluate the case based on the aggravating and mitigating 12 circumstances and perhaps be open to either the death penalty 13 or life imprisonment? 14 THE JUROR: I would evaluate the case. 1.5 THE COURT: And make a choice in either direction or 16 gravitate toward the death penalty? THE JUROR: Either. 17 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. WEINREB: Good afternoon, sir. 05:59 20 THE JUROR: Good afternoon. 21 MR. WEINREB: My name is Bill Weinreb. I'm one of the 22 prosecutors in the case. I just wanted to follow up on a few 23 of your answers in the questionnaire. 24 THE JUROR: Okay. 25 MR. WEINREB: So on page 8 of the questionnaire -- I'm

1 not going to ask about that -- Question 19 we asked whether any of your siblings has had a major positive or negative influence 2 on your life, and you said your sister's been very helpful in 3 4 every way. Can you tell us a little bit about that? What led 5 you to give that answer? 6 THE JUROR: We've been close all our lives. 7 needed anything -- if I need anything, I know she would be there for me or --8 9 MR. WEINREB: She lives in the same town as you? THE JUROR: Yes. 06:00 10 11 MR. WEINREB: Your back problem that you've had, has 12 that prevented you from getting around or taking care of 13 yourself in the sense of, you know, getting your groceries, 14 cooking your meals and so on, or was it more the kind of thing 15 that you just couldn't strain it? 16 THE JUROR: No, it was a very -- just a constant problem, night and day. 17 18 MR. WEINREB: And are there any lingering effects of 19 it that would make it difficult for you to sit in a jury box 06:01 20 day after day? 21 THE JUROR: No, after having surgery, that's 22 completely corrected. 23 MR. WEINREB: Turning to -- you don't need to turn to 24 your questionnaire if you don't want to, but in answer to 25 Question 31, you mention that your father had served in the

```
1
          Army. Was he -- did he serve in a war, do you know?
     2
                   THE JUROR: World War II, yes.
                   MR. WEINREB: Which theater was he -- did he go
     3
     4
          overseas?
     5
                   THE JUROR: He was in the Philippines.
                   MR. WEINREB: Do you know if he saw combat?
                   THE JUROR: He did not.
     7
                   MR. WEINREB: What was his position in the Army?
     8
     9
                   THE JUROR: Private.
06:02 10
                   MR. WEINREB: And did he talk to you about his
    11
          experience there?
                   THE JUROR: He told a few stories.
    12
    13
                   MR. WEINREB: Were they combat related at all?
    14
                   THE JUROR: No, personal. Really funny, funny
    1.5
          stories.
    16
                   MR. WEINREB: Okay. And then in answer to Questions
          47 and 48, you talked about your previous jury experience in
    17
          Cambridge, and you'd mentioned it was a good experience?
    18
    19
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
06:02 20
                   MR. WEINREB: What made it a good experience in your
    21
          view?
    22
                   THE JUROR: How?
    23
                   MR. WEINREB: How was it good?
    24
                   THE JUROR: Just I think the process is interesting.
    25
                   MR. WEINREB: Did the jury deliberate a long time in
```

1 that case, do you know? THE JUROR: They ended up settling out of court. 2 MR. WEINREB: So the jury never actually had to 3 deliberate? 4 5 THE JUROR: No. 6 MR. WEINREB: In answer to Question 74 when you were asked what did you think or feel when you received your jury 7 summons for this case, you wrote, "Mixed feelings." Could you 8 9 say what your feelings were and why you had mixed feelings? 06:03 10 THE JUROR: I'm sorry. The question again? 11 MR. WEINREB: If you want, it's on page 19. So it's 12 Ouestion 74. 13 THE JUROR: Mixed feelings? Because of my personal 14 situation where I'm between working and just having surgery 15 and -- I guess I hadn't decided whether I would be able to sort 16 of -- since then I fully realize it's -- I lost my train of 17 thought. 18 MR. WEINREB: Well, we can come back to that. 19 In answer to Question 75 at the bottom of the page you 06:05 20 said -- you were asked what kinds of things you said to others 21 or they said to you, and just that it would most likely be a 22 long trial. Was that all there was that you could recall that 23 anyone said or you said? 24 THE JUROR: Yes, that's mostly what people were 25 saying.

```
1
                   MR. WEINREB: So did you have mixed feelings about
          serving on the jury -- did those result from anything other
     2
          than that you just finally got your back problem fixed and
     3
          you're looking for work again and this was unexpected? Is
     4
     5
          there anything about the case itself that gave you mixed
     6
          feelings?
     7
                   THE JUROR: Possibly.
                   MR. WEINREB: Could you tell us about that?
     8
                   THE JUROR: It's a very tough case. I knew it would
     9
06:06 10
          be a long case, trial.
    11
                   MR. WEINREB: Is there anything else that makes it
    12
          tough?
    13
                   THE JUROR: No.
    14
                   MR. WEINREB: Okay. Thanks very much.
    15
                   MR. BRUCK: Your Honor, I think we need to go to
    16
          sidebar, but I wonder if we could possibly excuse the juror for
    17
          a moment. I know it's not how we usually do it.
                   THE COURT: Okay. We'll have a sidebar with just
    18
    19
          counsel. If you could step out for a minute.
06:06 20
                   MR. WILSON: Audio off.
    21
                   (The juror is excused.)
    22
                   (Discussion at sidebar and out of the hearing of the
    23
          public:)
    24
                   MR. WEINREB: Your Honor, I don't think we can draw
    25
          any conclusions about this juror's mental state based on his
```

```
affect, but he does seem quite uncomfortable about being
     1
          here --
     2
     3
                   THE COURT: Yeah.
                   MR. WEINREB: -- and I just don't want to put him
     4
     5
          through a four-month ordeal that might be very unpleasant for
          him.
     6
     7
                   THE COURT: I have the same --
     8
                   MR. BRUCK: We agree. I didn't want to put him
          through ten minutes of the ordeal about his --
     9
06:07 10
                   THE COURT: Right. I don't know what the explanation
    11
          is. I mean --
                   MR. WEINREB: I was just hoping maybe we could get him
    12
    13
          to open up.
    14
                   MR. BRUCK: He's been disabled for 23 years. It's not
    15
          just his back.
    16
                   THE COURT: Yeah. I think we can --
    17
                   MR. WEINREB: I think we can excuse him.
    18
                   THE CLERK: Can I tell him?
    19
                   THE COURT: Yeah, you can tell him he doesn't have to
06:08 20
          come back in.
    21
                   So we'll go off the sidebar.
    22
                   MR. WILSON: Video and audio back on.
    23
                   (In open court:)
    24
                   THE COURT: We're back live, just so you know.
    25
                   MS. CLARKE: Thank you.
```

```
1
                   THE CLERK: Juror No. 464.
                   THE JURY CLERK: Juror 464.
     2
     3
                   (The juror enters the courtroom.)
                   THE CLERK: Sir, over here, if you would, please.
     4
     5
          Have a seat. Make sure you speak into the mic, okay?
                   THE JUROR:
                               Yup.
                   THE COURT: Good afternoon.
     7
                   THE JUROR: Good afternoon.
     8
     9
                   THE COURT: Thanks for your patience.
                   THE JUROR: Absolutely.
06:09 10
    11
                   THE COURT: So since you were last here, have you been
    12
          able to avoid talking about the case or as much as possible
    13
          avoid media reports about it?
    14
                   THE JUROR: Yeah. Sure, yeah.
    1.5
                   THE COURT: So we're going to follow up on some of the
          questions you gave us in the questionnaire. I want to start
    16
    17
          with your work.
    18
                   THE JUROR: Uh-huh.
    19
                   THE COURT: You're an account manager for a tech
06:09 20
          company of some kind?
    21
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    22
                   THE COURT: What's the nature of the equipment?
    23
          say you sell technology equipment?
    24
                   THE JUROR: Yeah. So it's Internet security
    25
          equipment.
```

```
1
                   THE COURT: Hardware?
                   THE JUROR: And software, yes.
     2
                   THE COURT: Both?
     3
                   THE JUROR: Yup.
     4
     5
                   THE COURT: You understand the schedule of the case
          that we've outlined?
     6
     7
                   THE JUROR:
                               Yup.
                   THE COURT: And that's not going to be a problem for
     8
     9
          you?
06:10 10
                   THE JUROR: No.
    11
                   THE COURT: Out of the ordinary? I mean, it's a
    12
          problem for anybody.
    13
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
    14
                   THE COURT: But it's not an unusual burden for you?
                   THE JUROR: Well, I'm a commissioned employee, so it
    15
    16
          would be a little burdensome, obviously.
    17
                   THE COURT: You do have -- you know, we tried to
          structure it so people had some ability to keep up with work.
    18
    19
                   THE JUROR: Uh-huh.
06:10 20
                   THE COURT: One day a week anyway, and then evenings
    21
          and so on. Does that help at all?
    22
                   THE JUROR: Yeah. I mean, it's burdensome for anybody
    23
          who's going to be on a jury. I understand that.
    24
                   THE COURT: So it's something you're okay with?
    25
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
```

```
1
                   THE COURT: Okay. You told us that you had a couple
          of close friends who served in Iraq and one also in
     2
          Afghanistan. Can you tell us about them? Take each one.
     3
     4
                   THE JUROR: Sure. So my next-door neighbor growing up
     5
          served in both Iraq and Afghanistan, and one of my good friends
     6
          from high school served in both Iraq and Afghanistan as well.
                               They were both in both places?
     7
                   THE COURT:
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
     8
     9
                   THE COURT: And you said they both experienced combat
          while there?
06:11 10
    11
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
                   THE COURT: Was either of them injured?
    12
    13
                   THE JUROR:
                              No.
    14
                   THE COURT: Have you talked with them in detail about
    15
          their experiences?
    16
                   THE JUROR: Some level of detail, yeah.
    17
                   THE COURT: Yeah?
    18
                   You also -- I'm now on page 12. You also have some
    19
          friends with the Arlington police?
06:11 20
                   THE JUROR: Uh-huh.
    21
                   THE COURT: Your best friend, you say?
    22
                   THE JUROR: Yes.
    23
                   THE COURT: And tell us about them, those --
    24
                   THE JUROR: So my best friend is an Arlington police
    25
          officer for the past two or three years. He was called into
```

```
1
          action in Watertown on the night -- a couple of nights after
          the marathon bombing. And so he was in there overnight, as
     2
          well as a few of the guys he worked with.
     3
     4
                   THE COURT: Do you know what he was tasked with doing
     5
          that night or what his activities were?
     6
                   THE JUROR: I think they were all sort of just given a
          sector to monitor until they found --
     7
                   THE COURT: Was he involved in the shootout?
     8
                   THE JUROR: No, he wasn't. He was called in after the
     9
06:12 10
          shootout.
    11
                   THE COURT: Okay. And how about -- you have two other
    12
          friends also on the Arlington police?
    13
                   THE JUROR: Yeah, so I have a few friends who are on
    14
          the -- I mean, a bunch of friends were on the Arlington police
    15
          force: my best friend, and then a few other friends that I
    16
          play softball with who were also called into action that night.
    17
                   THE COURT: And have you talked with them about what
          they experienced and saw and so on that night?
    18
    19
                   THE JUROR: Yeah.
06:12 20
                   THE COURT: Why don't you take a look at page 12,
    21
          Question 36.
    22
                   THE JUROR: Sure.
    23
                   THE COURT: You know, we typically instruct jurors
    24
          they're to evaluate all the testimony by the same criteria, and
    25
          that means not giving any special treatment one way or the
```

1 other to people because of their employment or background and 2 so on. 3 THE JUROR: Sure. THE COURT: And so we asked that particularly about 4 5 law enforcement officers. You said that you might tend to give greater weight to the testimony of law enforcement officers 6 than other witnesses? 7 THE JUROR: My answer is, I would say, yes. 8 9 THE COURT: Now, let me ask you to look at Question 77. 06:14 10 11 THE JUROR: What page is that? 12 THE COURT: That's on page 20. 13 Here we asked whether -- based on things you'd seen or 14 heard either from the media or perhaps other places, whether 15 you had formed opinions about whether the defendant was guilty 16 or not and whether he should receive the death penalty or not. 17 THE JUROR: Uh-huh. 18 THE COURT: With respect to Parts A and B, you 19 answered that you had formed an opinion that he was guilty. 06:14 20 Below that we asked if you answered yes to any of the 21 questions, would you be able or unable to set aside your 22 opinion and base your decision about guilt solely on the 23 evidence that would be presented to you in court, and you said 24 "unable." Can you explain that? 25 THE JUROR: Yeah, I think just from what I'd read and

```
1
          heard and seen, you know, prior to being called in as a juror,
          I think I'd formed a pretty strong opinion, and I think it
     2
          would be difficult for me to go back on sort of some of the
     3
     4
          beliefs I have about what transpired during the marathon
     5
          bombing.
     6
                   MR. BRUCK: We're satisfied, your Honor.
     7
                   THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
                   THE JUROR: Thank you.
     8
     9
                    (The juror exits the courtroom.)
06:15 10
                   THE COURT: So that's it for the questioning. Why
          don't we come back about 3:30.
    11
    12
                   MS. CLARKE: Great.
    13
                   THE COURT: Okay?
    14
                   MR. WILSON: Audio and video is off.
    15
                    (The Court exits the courtroom at 3:03 p.m.)
    16
                   (There is a recess in the proceedings at 3:03 p.m.)
    17
                    (The Court enters the courtroom at 3:45 p.m.)
    18
                    (Discussion at sidebar and out of the hearing of the
    19
          public:)
06:58 20
                   THE COURT: So I think 412 and 435 were dealt with as
    21
          we went along. I think that brings us to 441.
    22
                   MS. CLARKE: No motion.
    23
                   MR. WEINREB: No motion.
    24
                   MR. BRUCK: That was no motion.
    25
                   THE COURT: No motion?
```

1 444. MR. WEINREB: Your Honor, that's a government motion. 2 3 MR. BRUCK: There's no argument. MS. CLARKE: Without argument. 4 5 THE COURT: 447? MR. WEINREB: Same thing, government motion. 7 MS. CLARKE: Same thing. THE COURT: All right. 448? 8 9 MS. CLARKE: That's a defense motion, your Honor. That's the Red Sox fan who --06:59 10 11 THE COURT: Yes. The estate manager. 12 MS. CLARKE: There's three areas of concern that we 13 wanted to express to the Court. First, I think she seemed like 14 a very good person. I actually liked her, seemed very honest. 1.5 But there are three sorts of impairments that we think 16 disqualify her. 17 First, there's the level of emotion that she attaches to the events. She said, "I cried." "I felt numb." "I felt 18 19 guilty." "Why did you feel guilty?" "I wasn't there." Now, 07:00 20 Ms. Conrad was doing the questioning and was not allowed by the 2.1 Court to follow up on what that actually meant and how she was 22 actually affected, but there was, beyond most of the people 23 that have qualified, a lot of somehow emotional reaction to the 24 events. And particularly when she said, "I felt quilty that I

wasn't there. I cried and I felt numb," that caused us a great

25

07:01 20

07:00 10

deal of concern about her level of attachment or reaction.

The second thing that is of concern is really not being allowed to get into her death penalty views. I know there was a lot of discussion about whether she was for or against the death penalty, and when we got into the -- she talked about, "Yes, I don't want somebody who is reliving the crime" -- "I think they should get the death penalty and I don't think others should." It was very confusing. And when Ms. Conrad tried to pin her down on "Are you talking about premeditated, intentional murder?" there was an objection about that, and whether or not that had a legal meaning or a practical meaning, and Ms. Conrad said something about, "Well, a planned murder" and that got stopped. So we were never really allowed to get into what she was thinking about her view on the death penalty.

But the third and final real problem was the final question by Ms. Conrad, was the mitigation impairment question. And she said, "No, I can't consider the defendant's background, character, other things about the defendant's life." And nobody followed up on that. That was just simply a, "No, I can't consider those things." So the combination, seems to us, disqualifies her.

MR. WEINREB: Your Honor, the government opposes the motion. With respect to her level of emotion, I mean, the Court was able to see her, and I don't think that she showed a

07:03 20

07:02 10

level of emotion that was particularly striking. What she said was that -- she was asked how she felt when she first heard about what had happened, and she said that initially she felt numb and that at a later point, thinking back on it, she cried.

But I mean, this was a shocking event to many people.

And to initially -- to have your initial reaction to feel numb

and to shed some tears over the death of some people is nothing

that disqualifies somebody from jury service and, indeed, I

think recommends them for jury service. It shows that they're

human and they have the capacity for empathy.

There was nothing particularly about this event versus any murder that one might hear about on the news, like what happened in Newtown or anywhere else, that this juror might have had the same reaction to, so I don't see how that disqualifies her as a juror.

I disagree with Ms. Clarke about her assessment that the Court blocked thorough questioning about her views on the death penalty. I thought that that was explored pretty well with her. I mean, she may not have been the most articulate or precise in making distinctions about things, but through examples that she herself offered and through follow-up questions, she freely gave examples of aggravating factors that would influence her and others where she felt other factors would be mitigating factors. She at one point talked about lack of a motive as being a mitigating factor, she talked about

07:04 20

07:04 10

certain kinds of things as being aggravating factors, and almost unwittingly gave examples of exactly what jurors in death penalty cases are supposed to do, which was consider all the different factors. And that was the theme of her discussion about it.

And then finally, I dispute this -- the claim that she said that she could not consider any mitigating factors. That is not at all what Ms. Conrad asked at the end. What she asked specifically was in the case of a premeditated murder, could you take account of the defendant's background. And "background" is a very broad term. It embraces not only some things that might be legitimate mitigating factors but things that may be specifically excluded as mitigating -- as factors, like the defendant's race, his religion, his ethnicity and other things that also fall in the category of background. And nobody blocked any follow-up on that. Ms. Conrad thought that she had nailed this juror and that that was going to disqualify her, and she immediately said, "No further questions," and the juror was excused.

That one answer, I think especially to a very broad and ambiguous question, I do not think can undo or negate all the very clear answers she gave previous to that, that she is somebody who could weigh aggravating and mitigating factors and decide each case on its facts.

MS. CLARKE: If I might, just a couple of points. On

07:06 20

07:05 10

the question of getting under premeditated or planned, I think it was the juror who used the word "premeditated." What Ms. Conrad was trying to do was find out what she meant by "premeditated." And we got kind of off -- and I understand -- is there a legal definition or a human definition.

The other thing, on the last question, my recollection of what Ms. Conrad asked was, "Would you be able to consider things about the defendant himself, like his background?" And she said, "No." So the record's pretty unambiguous on the mitigation impairment of this juror.

THE COURT: Just on that last point, the record might or might not be unambiguous, but it's unconvincing as well. We are constantly running into the phenomenon of laypeople who have not thought very deeply about these matters necessarily at all being asked to give rather precise answers, sometimes being asked in terms that we understand in a way that they may or may not understand it the same way. And I think to try to be too literal in the interpretation of the jurors' answers is a mistake. I mean, this is an assessment of whether a juror can be open as necessary to -- in the penalty phase either possibility, and my overall assessment of her is that she can be.

She seems like a very self-confident, experienced person if she ran the estate that she described, and, you know, supervising a staff and so on and so forth. She seemed to me

```
1
          to be the kind of person that can do what she's tasked to do.
          And of course when we get to things like terms of art, she will
     2
          have very specific instructions about what that means under the
     3
          circumstances. And a word like "background," for example,
     4
     5
          would be explained in much greater specificity as to what can
     6
          be considered and not considered. And of course that will be
          done in the light of what has been produced in the course of
     7
          the trial that can be characterized as aggravating or
     8
     9
          mitigating, and the instructions will make a great deal more
07:07 10
          sense.
    11
                    So what I'm looking for is somebody who I expect will
    12
          respond correctly to those kinds of instructions on that body
    13
          of evidence, and I think she can do that. So I would deny the
    14
          strike.
    1.5
                    452?
    16
                   MR. BRUCK: No motion.
    17
                   MR. WEINREB: No motion.
    18
                   THE COURT: No motion? Okay. The afternoon was not
    19
          productive, I think.
07:08 20
                    (Laughter.)
    21
                   MS. CLARKE: It's all agreed, I think.
    22
                   THE COURT: Anybody disagree with that?
    23
                   MS. CLARKE: Well, productive.
    24
                   THE COURT: It was interesting. We met some nice
    25
          people, but...
```

1 MS. CLARKE: Okay. THE COURT: So I think we have -- let's see. 2 one, two, three? 3 4 MS. CLARKE: That's right. 5 THE COURT: Now, everybody's doing their best, but, again, we shrank down to a smaller number. And I don't 6 discourage you from agreeing on the eliminations; I just would 7 like to maybe make a little more progress. So I'm thinking of 8 9 increasing the number to 25 for our pool for Tuesday. It will 07:08 10 shrink to 15 and we'll be able to handle it, is my --11 MS. CLARKE: That's the first time we won't be able to 12 screen --THE COURT: Well, I don't know. 13 14 Let me just call your attention to two -- I'm told 15 there are two -- I had proposed some and I know the parties had 16 agreed on some, and there were a couple of ones that I guess 17 the parties do not agree with my proposal. And I just urge you to take a second look at it. 489 and 501. Actually, I think I 18 19 left my note upstairs. I believe one is a -- it looks like a 07:09 20 production-line laborer, if I'm thinking of the right one, and 21 the other, I think, was an auto mechanic. I mean, they kind of 22 fit in what we've been doing. There might be other issues; I 23 don't remember. But just take another look at 489 and 501. 24 MS. CLARKE: 501 was a union member, so we didn't know 25 whether he got paid or not.

THE COURT: Oh, because he was a tile guy, a 1 2 bricklayer. 3 MR. McALEAR: Tile finisher. 4 THE COURT: Yeah, it was the bricklayers union. 5 know that because my grandfather was in the bricklayers union. 6 MS. CLARKE: Do they pay? 7 THE COURT: Not in those days. (Laughter.) 8 9 MR. WEINREB: Sometimes the confusion with these 07:10 10 arises because there's no claim of hardship. 11 THE COURT: Yeah. Yes, I was thinking about that. 12 Although it's sort of appearing to me over the time that was 13 our original marker, was that if they claimed it and it 14 appeared to be valid in 26, it was an easy way to do it. 1.5 have developed a sense that people early on, being good 16 citizens, said "no" to 10, and then as things got on, they got 17 more accustomed -- I've seen a couple of them, I'm sure you did too, that we see the comment in the 70 series, 74 we'll see a 18 19 comment, or in the 98 range they'll add it, but they won't go 07:10 20 back and amend Question 10. So I'm not sure 10 is as reliable 2.1 a marker as we may have thought. 22 So anyway --23 MR. WEINREB: We'll take another look. THE COURT: -- take another look at those two. 24 25 MS. CLARKE: Didn't we have another labor member or

1 two that did get paid? THE COURT: I remember the thought occurring to me 2 with a teacher -- I think she was excused anyway -- when she 3 said her contract provided something. And it occurred to me it 4 5 was at a collective-bargaining agreement or an individual 6 contract. But I don't think we ever answered that question. 7 think there are -- there are laborers who kind of work through the union. 8 9 MS. CLARKE: Right, and they get paid. 07:11 10 THE COURT: The carpenters, for example, have that 11 kind of arrangement. But anyway... 12 MR. WEINREB: So, your Honor, before you came in, so 13 Mr. McAlear gave us the next 20 and then the next 10 after 14 that. And we will get together over the weekend and see if we 1.5 can agree on any more. And it would be useful if you could 16 also review them --17 THE COURT: I will. MR. WEINREB: -- over the weekend. 18 19 And then Mr. McAlear said if we get him the results by 07:11 20 Monday, he can backfill. 21 THE COURT: We can adjust accordingly. That's fine. MR. WEINREB: So should we email -- how should we 22 23 communicate? Should we email them to Jim or --24 THE COURT: Yeah, we'll go through Jim. That's the 25 easiest way.

1 MS. CLARKE: Right now that would take us through 504 if we're calling in 25 to look at? 2 MR. McALEAR: Yup. 3 MS. CLARKE: And that's including 501 and 489, so... 4 5 THE COURT: Right. So that's adjustable too. Let me also comment that the last fellow had multiple 7 issues. MR. WEINREB: We've discussed that he should have 8 9 been -- he slipped through the cracks. 07:12 10 THE COURT: Yeah, that was a waste of time. 11 MR. WEINREB: That was a waste of time. We all agree with that. We'll take the hit for that. 12 13 MS. CLARKE: They're taking it. Sometimes we do. 14 THE COURT: The people on the sensitive issues, the 1.5 77- and the 88-plus series, that's fine. We'll talk to all 16 those people. But if there's somebody who has a cousin who was 17 killed in Iraq and was affected by it or whatever, that's 18 something that maybe we can... 19 A couple of just-while-I-have-you items. In addition 07:13 20 to the Globe's motion to alter the arrangements, which we were 21 about to -- I think we haven't filed it yet. We're about to 22 file it, a disposition. They also filed a motion for access to 23 the legal rulings on the things that we're doing here. 24 The time has passed for any response from the parties. 25 I gather there is no response from the parties. We'll act on

that. I just wanted to confirm that, that we don't have to wait for anything on that?

MR. WEINREB: No.

07:14 20

07:14 10

THE COURT: Okay. We're getting close, I think, to completing this. If we don't get any more winter storms, we should be in pretty good shape.

MS. CLARKE: That's a big "if" right now.

THE COURT: I know. Well, fortunately this one is well-placed. It's right in the middle of the weekend. But there is talk of something perhaps later in the week. But I think we're getting pretty close.

So the time has come to start thinking beyond that, and one thing -- and I'm not asking for answers now. I just want to -- what I'm beginning to think about is once we have finished the jury empanelment, which can include the peremptory process, whatever we decide on that, whether it will be necessary to take some time to address any motions in limine that need to be resolved before openings and the beginning of evidence, and if we do, how much time we have to do for that.

We're getting inquiries from the press regularly.

Most people are not as interested in this process as they will be in the actual beginning of the case. And there are people who will travel to get here. And so we're constantly -- we're not -- but the people downstairs are constantly getting inquiries. And so partly out of just good relations we would

1.5

07:16 20

07:15 10

like to keep them up to speed a little bit without -- we won't tell them what we can't tell them.

So I just am interested in what you may be thinking about that. My thought is we might be able to -- once we figure out -- we'll still have to finish this because we have to know when the time breaks. But when we've done that, we may be able to pick a date and tell them this is the date we will swear the jury in, begin the case. So that's something to think of.

MS. CLARKE: Judge, we filed a while back a -- sort of in the -- it looked like a status report/in limine evidentiary issues, and we tried to set forth in that the ones we thought needed to be ruled on before openings.

THE COURT: Okay. If that needs updating -
MS. CLARKE: We can look at that again. And I think
the government just responded to that.

MR. WEINREB: I think it may have been overtaken by events, and there are now more things to add to it, so...

MS. CLARKE: We should look at that.

MR. WEINREB: Yeah. Maybe the parties also can exchange lists of what we think are sort of the critical ones to be addressed before opening statements.

THE COURT: Well, that's it. I mean, stepping back from this case, every time we begin a case we get motions in limine. And I may think that it's -- about 20 percent of them

are worth ruling on before the case begins. A lot of them you have to wait and see how things are developing in the case.

They're often contingent on developments in the case. Some clearly have to be done because somebody wants to say something about it in the opening.

So I'm interested in that group more than the ongoing group. We can deal with those as we need to.

MR. WEINREB: Sure.

1.5

07:17 20

07:16 10

THE COURT: So I don't know whether -- again, at some point we should consider once the jury empanelment process is over what sealed matters might be opened. We've had a lot of sealed things just to protect the process. There will be some things that I think will have to remain under seal until the conclusion of the case so they don't affect the trial, but there may be other things not in that category and we could deal with that.

For example, I would think that the transcripts of the voir dire would remain sealed through the trial because I think the cases say -- the First Amendment cases I think permit that. But I don't think it would be wise to have the voir dire transcript of a sitting juror available for publication. I think it will be an invitation to mischief, personal matters, things like that.

And finally on that -- thinking forward, I know that for the preliminary instructions both back in January and now

1 what I'm doing today you got together and made some proposals. I don't know if you're going to have similar proposals for 2 opening instructions of the case itself. My practice in a 3 run-of-the-mill case is not to give substantive instructions at 4 5 the beginning of the case; it's really an outline of how we'll 6 proceed and a little bit about the rules of evidence and why they'll see people objecting and me ruling and things like 7 that. I mean, you've probably heard me do it. But I don't 8 9 know if you have anything more specific about that. It is the case in a run-of-the-mill case that I would 07:18 10 11 read the relevant language of the indictment at the beginning 12 of the case, you know, the man's charged with being a felon in 13 possession of a handgun or something like that. 14 MS. CLARKE: We might have to add a day to the start, 1.5 then. 16 THE COURT: But I don't intend to read this 17 indictment. And I don't know whether you can think of an 18 appropriate substitute that you would like to propose, that's 19 all. 07:19 20 I guess for purposes of the record -- is this the list 21 I'm supposed to read? I have to ask the boss. 22 (Laughter.) 23 THE COURT: Is this it? 24 LAW CLERK: That's one of them, yeah. 25 THE COURT: Do I have another one? Oh, this one?

```
1
          This too? Yeah, okay. Just so it's on the record as to ones
          that have not been qualified for service, we'll start with
     2
          today's -- well, other than -- I think we'll do it -- it
     3
          doesn't include what we have here, right? What we just did
     4
     5
          this afternoon. I think we'll --
                   MS. CLARKE: Write it up?
                   THE COURT: -- write it up. I just want to be sure.
     7
                   MS. CLARKE: Judge, I have one thing while we're here
     8
          too. The Court indicated that there would -- its common
     9
07:20 10
          practice is no back-strikes. Could the Court just again tell
    11
          us what your plan is for striking?
    12
                   THE COURT: So you fill --
    13
                   MS. CLARKE: Except they won't be here.
    14
                   THE COURT: Well, whatever.
    15
                   MS. CLARKE: Yes. You fill a piece of paper or you
    16
          fill a box.
                   THE COURT: Right. So there's -- let's just talk
    17
    18
          about 12 first, because then we can talk separately about the
    19
          alternates.
07:20 20
                   MS. CLARKE: Sure.
    21
                   THE COURT: You have 12 jurors. It comes peremptory
          time, both parties would come up. The government would go
    22
    23
          first and say, 2, 4, 6, 8.
    24
                   MR. BRUCK: And the 12 jurors are the first 12
    25
          qualified in order?
```

```
1
                   THE COURT: Yes, in order. Correct. We don't
          rejumble them once -- so I guess they'll follow this
     2
          numerically. So consider them Seats 1 through 12, 2, 4, 6, 8.
     3
          And then the defense goes 3, 5, 7, 9. All those people are
     4
     5
          excused, those seats are refilled in order.
                   MS. CLARKE: The seats aren't refilled until both
     7
          parties have struck?
                   THE COURT: Correct. Right.
     8
                   And so that was eight seats. So eight new people come
     9
          into the box in those seats. The four who were not struck are
07:21 10
    11
                 They're on the jury. The eight new seats are subject to
          further strikes.
    12
    13
                   The second round the defense goes first, picks theirs,
    14
          followed by government.
    1.5
                   MS. CLARKE: Out of the eight?
    16
                   THE COURT: Out of the eight.
                   So if seven are excused, seven new people come in.
    17
    18
          goes back, first the government, then the defense. Now you've
    19
          got three people left. And it keeps narrowing like that.
07:21 20
                   MS. CONRAD: Any limitation on the number of strikes?
    21
                   THE COURT: No.
    22
                   MS. CONRAD: Not two, two?
    23
                   THE COURT: No, no, just do them all at once.
                   MS. CLARKE: Out of the 12?
    24
    25
                   THE COURT: And do as many as you want. You can
```

strike all 12 if you wanted.

07:23 20

07:22 10

Now, that brings up the question of how to deal with alternates in this case. In a run-of-the-mill case we would have 12 and two alternates, and it's easy to track the alternates. And as I said, my practice is just to advise everybody they will be the last two people seated and they could be in seats 3 and 11. We don't put them off to the side or anything like that. And a principal reason for that is they don't know who they are. There would be a few more here.

I was thinking about it in terms of what's allowed, which is 20 for the 12, plus three for the six alternates for each side, and that's 23. You could interpret that as meaning you get 20 to use on the first 12 and you only have three to use on the other six. That's a little -- I think more cumbersome, and if the parties don't object I'd just give you 23 and you use them however you want.

I think there's some advantage to the parties in that latter approach because you can front-end a little bit more if you have to import one of the alternate ones to get somebody in the original 12 before we've gotten to the last six. You may, you know, be better off. You may get 21 for them rather than 20 if you don't -- if you do the accounting that way. So maybe -- but I think it would be easier to do it that way.

But if you think we have to count separately, I guess we can do that. We can say, Okay. We haven't gotten to the

1 last six jurors yet. You only have 20, you're done, or something like that. I don't know. You can think about that. 2 I don't know that there's any rule that affects that, but we 3 4 could adjust it. 5 MR. WEINREB: So --6 Did you have something? MS. CLARKE: No, I was just trying to understand the 7 process. 8 9 MR. WEINREB: So, your Honor, unless the Court is 07:23 10 wedded to that particular system, we would like to propose a 11 different system largely because that system does not seem to be well adapted to this particular situation where each side 12 13 has so many strikes, 23 strikes. You only have 12 people in 14 the box. And it also seems to have -- frankly, from our point 15 of view, waste a lot of the work that the parties have put into 16 trying to identify who we think would be the best jurors in the 17 case because it puts a tremendous amount of emphasis on the people who are numbered 1, 2, 3, 4 versus people who may be 18 19 more suitable as jurors further back in the pool. 07:24 20 And we propose a system where the parties just take 21 turns striking two people from the pool at a time until we're 22 all done with our peremptories, and that way --23 THE COURT: You mean just on the master list? MR. WEINREB: Just on the list of the 70 or however 24 25 many are qualified. Right, and then they'll --

```
1
                   THE COURT: Starting at the beginning?
                   MR. WEINREB: No, just anywhere in the pool. Because
     2
          the -- at this point we're going to know who they all are.
     3
     4
          We'll be able to identify them by number very easily.
     5
                   THE COURT: So your first strike could be Number 70?
     6
                   MR. WEINREB: Exactly. Well, except Number 70 would
          have no chance of being sat if --
     7
                   THE COURT: All right. Number 64.
     8
     9
                   Well, I'm not so sure of that. That's why we have
          Number 70 --
07:25 10
    11
                   MR. WEINREB: But at some point we'll have the pool.
    12
                   THE COURT: Right.
    13
                   MR. WEINREB: And that way it also seems fairer,
    14
          frankly, because otherwise the -- again, the government's in
    15
          the position of having to go first and potentially strike any
    16
          number of people who we don't particularly object to just
    17
          because we don't know -- without -- normally you know you're
    18
          going to get to use up all your peremptories because you don't
    19
          have very many to begin with. Here you would be risking
07:26 20
          forfeiting a lot of --
    21
                   THE COURT: I think that's right. I think there's a
    22
          possibility, if we did it the way I've outlined it, that
    23
          neither side would use all their peremptories.
    24
                   MR. WEINREB: But the parties are allocated this
    25
          number of peremptories for a reason, and I assume the reason is
```

```
1
          that when it comes to a case like this, there was the belief
          that the parities are entitled to have more say in who they
     2
          think the jurors ought to be and have more chance to strike
     3
          people who they believe really don't fit the qualifications of
     4
     5
          a juror in a death penalty case.
     6
                   And so we're not really going to have as much of an
     7
          opportunity to get the benefit of what Congress gave if we have
     8
          to do it this way versus the other way.
     9
                   THE COURT: Well --
07:26 10
                   MR. BRUCK: We think we're fine with the Court's
    11
          proposal, but we would like to think about it over the weekend.
    12
                   THE COURT: Yeah, think about it. It's new to me too.
    13
          I don't know. I can't react to it. Will I entertain it? Yes.
    14
          Will I do it? I don't know.
    1.5
                    (Laughter.)
    16
                   THE COURT: I'm not sure.
    17
                   MS. CLARKE: Unsure. Maybe. Ask me tomorrow.
    18
                   MR. BRUCK: The question is: Will you ever be able to
    19
          say?
07:27 20
                   MS. CLARKE: Thank you very much.
    21
                   THE COURT: Okay. Thanks.
    22
                    (The Court exits the courtroom and the proceedings
    23
          adjourned at 4:15 p.m.)
    24
    25
```

1		С	Ε	R	Τ	I	F	I	С	Α	Τ	Ε
---	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

We, Marcia G. Patrisso, RMR, CRR, and Cheryl Dahlstrom, RMR, CRR, Official Reporters of the United States District Court, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript constitutes, to the best of our skill and ability, a true and accurate transcription of our stenotype notes taken in the matter of Criminal Action No. 13-10200-GAO, United States of America v. Dzhokhar A. Tsarnaev.

11 /s/ Marcia G. Patrisso
MARCIA G. PATRISSO, RMR, CRR
12 Official Court Reporter

/s/ Cheryl Dahlstrom

CHERYL DAHLSTROM, RMR, CRR

15 Date: 2/13/15